Haitians’ Labor and Leisure on Cuban Sugar Plantations: The Limits of Company Control

Alejo Carpentier’s 1927 novel, ¡Écue-Yamba-Ó! (2002:18, 21, 52, 65-66), describes rural Cuba during World War I as a place in which “life is organized according to [sugar’s] will.” One effect of sugar production was the “new plague” of “ragged Haitians” or “black mercenaries with straw hats and machetes at their belts.” When not cutting cane, these immigrants sequestered themselves in their barracones (labor barracks), the “stone constructions, long like a hangar, with iron window panes” that were originally built for slaves to inhabit. Haitians and other immigrants were the targets of scorn from Carpentier’s protagonist, Menegildo Cue, an Afro-Cuban individual who drove oxen on the local sugar plantation. He “felt strange among so many blacks with other customs and languages. The Jamaicans were ‘snobby’ and animals! The Haitians were animals and savages!” Cue also complained that Cubans “were without work since the braceros from Haiti accepted incredibly low daily wages!”

As Carpentier’s text emphasizes, the arrival of Haitian laborers in eastern Cuba in the first half of the twentieth century was part and parcel of massive rural transformations as a result of the rapid growth of sugar production on the island. In 1898, the United States intervened militarily in Cuba’s wars for independence, hastening the defeat of Spain and limiting the victory of the Cuban separatists. Rather than enjoying full independence from Spain, Cubans were now subject to a new colonial relationship with the United States. While some sectors of Cuban society questioned the role that sugar should play after independence, a rush of investors and politicians from both Cuba and the United
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States sought to increase production. In 1898, Cuba produced 350,000 short tons of sugar. When U.S. troops left the island in 1902, production had more than doubled to 973,000 short tons. Cuban sugar production peaked in 1929, at 5,775,000 short tons (Ayala 1999:70, McGillivray 2009:36, 75, 86).

This phase of sugar production was distinct from previous periods. At the end of the nineteenth century, new, modernized mills called *centrales* began replacing the older *ingenios* (Iglesias Garcia 1999). These new mills had an increased capacity to grind cane, which they obtained either from cane fields owned by the company or more often by contract from farmers called *colono*s. *Centrales* were especially prevalent in the eastern provinces of Oriente and Camagüey, the new regions of production. Whereas in 1901, 15 percent of Cuba’s sugar was produced in these zones, by the 1920s and 1930s, they were responsible for over half of the sugar crop (Ayala 1999:220, Santamaría García 2001:419).

In Oriente and Camagüey, sugar expansion was paired with an influx of individuals from various parts of the Americas, Europe, and Asia. Sugar-producing areas attracted workers of all types from the United States, Spain, the Canary Islands, China, and various parts of the Caribbean and Latin America. During the first years of the twentieth century, planters requested governmental permission to bring in contract laborers from Haiti, the British West Indies, and other neighboring islands. Their petitions revived longstanding, racially charged debates throughout the island about Cuba’s labor needs and the ideal demographic makeup of the island (Naranjo Ororio & García González 1996). Despite opposition from Cuban journalists and even individuals within the Cuban government, sugar companies, with the support of the U.S. government, exerted enough political pressure to have Caribbean immigration legalized by 1913 (McLeod 2000:22-42).

As Carpentier’s text illustrates, one of the largest sources of labor power behind this sugar expansion came from almost half a million immigrants from other parts of the Caribbean, especially Haiti and the British West Indies. Haitian and British West Indian migrants were heavily concentrated in the provinces of Oriente and Camagüey. At the regional and local level, the effects of sugar production and migration were especially noticeable. From 1907 to 1919, the populations of Oriente and Camagüey increased by 60.6 percent and 93.6 percent respectively, making them the fastest-growing regions in a country whose overall population increased by 33 percent in the period. By 1919, Oriente’s population had surpassed that of the province of Havana. The influence of migration from other parts of the Caribbean is especially apparent in this process. In 1919, individuals who were not born in Cuba, Spain, the United States, China, or Africa represented 5.86 percent of the population of Oriente province and 4.75 percent in Camagüey. These immigrants were even more heavily concentrated in areas with large sugar mills. They represented 8.14 percent of the inhabitants of Banes, the site of the United Fruit Company
planted in Oriente. In Las Tunas, the site of the Chaparra sugar mill, they made up 11 percent of the population (Cuba 1920:286, 290, 434).

The last legal arrival of Caribbean immigrants into Cuba occurred in 1931. In the decade that followed, tens of thousands of Afro-Caribbean immigrants were deported from Cuban soil, including 38,000 Haitians. Although diminished by repatriations, Haitians’ presence remained significant in eastern Cuba (McLeod 2000:2). In 1970, there were still 22,579 Haitians living there (Espronceda Amor 2001:20-21).

Carpentier’s assertions about the omnipotence of Cuban sugar companies and their ability to maintain a segregated workforce in which Haitians remained at the bottom reflect commonly held beliefs in 1920s Cuba that have strongly influenced present-day historical accounts. As a result, the experiences of Haitian migrants are often described in terms of alienation and isolation, victims of a “monolithic wall of rejection” (Lucassen & Lucassen 1997:21), which obscures their humanity and agency. Haitians’ integration into Cuban society is either left unexplored as a result of the repatriations or inscribed into contemporary nationalists’ narratives of Cuban multiculturalism.2

This article seeks to provide an analysis of Haitian migrants’ working and leisure experiences in Cuba that does not assume the complete domination of company and state. I begin by exploring the images that sugar company administrators and Cuban newspapers projected about the labor and social hierarchies in Cuban society in which Haitians were said to inhabit the lowest positions. I will then reconstruct Haitians’ working lives to show the variety of labor activities they performed in cane fields and sugar centrales as well as the frequency with which they worked alongside people of other nationalities. Building on recent scholarship on labor history and the Cuban sugar industry, the article traces Haitians’ strategies to improve the conditions in which they lived and labored outside of formal labor unions. Their use of what James C. Scott famously called the “weapons of the weak” entailed negotiations and confrontations with company managers on worksites over better conditions and wages (Scott 1985:29). Strategies of resistance and adaptation also included participation in social and commercial networks on sugar plantations with individuals of other nationalities. The existence of cross-national networks and communities before, during, and after the decade of deportations suggest that these exchanges are fundamental to understanding the experiences of Haitian migrants in the island. Furthermore, the existence of these communities and the initiatives of Haitian migrants need to be taken into account in any serious discussion about their integration into Cuban society.

2. For an exception to this trend see Espronceda Amor 2001.
During the first decades of the twentieth century, the Cuban press depicted Caribbean migrant workers as impoverished cane cutters who drove down wages for native workers. In 1916, *La Política Cómica* published a satirical column about the “tourists of color” who were arriving regularly from Haiti and Jamaica. They reportedly came to Cuba “to enjoy themselves cutting cane, accepting for sport a lower daily wage than what is paid” to Cubans.3 Santiago’s *Diario de Cuba* used a combination of racial and economic logic to explain why Haitians were particularly apt for cane cutting. “The cane needs Haitian arms,” argued the newspaper, since cane cutting “is a work to which races of a superior civilization do not adapt ... Sugar cannot be produced in Cuba by paying a higher salary than the one for which Haitians work.”4 In 1928, during a brief emigration ban from Haiti, the Cuban commercial press wondered “Who would take the place of the Haitians in the cane fields, since it is well known that Cubans will not cut cane?” “Cuban sugar growers,” they added, “could not afford to pay [the] higher wages” Cubans would inevitably demand.5

The belief that Haitians were ideal only for cutting cane was shared by sugar companies who attempted to segregate their workers. Employing a technique originating in the period of slavery and prevalent in agricultural and industrial settings throughout the Americas into the twentieth century, Cuban plantation managers sought to divide workers along racial, national, or ethnic lines. The goal was to take advantage of the putative abilities of each group and prevent mobilization across labor sectors. Such divisions also played a strong role establishing and reinforcing racial hierarchies on worksites.6 Reports by company administrators seem to confirm management plans and their effects on worker interactions. Frank Garnett, the superintendent of the Cuba Company in Camagüey described his decision “to house [Chinese laborers] in the batey separate from all other labor. Chinese are particularly suited to [work in the sugar centrifuges], and it should put an end to strikes in this department of the sugar house.”7 Other officials from the
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Like Cuban newspapers, company officials contributed to the idea that Haitians, even more than British West Indians, were cane cutters. They employed the word Haitian to signify black cane cutters and usually assumed that other immigrant groups were more upwardly mobile. During the 1905 sugar harvest, a fire broke out in the cane fields near the San Miguel Sugar Mill in Guantánamo. Salvador G. Rodiles y Vilallonga, the Cuban-born mayoral (manager), told officials that it began “very close to five black Haitians who were cutting cane,” though he did not actually know their origins. In 1928, a recruiter in charge of “contracting and bringing braceros for the labors of the zafra [sugar harvest]” for the Santa Lucía Sugar Company was told to hire “whomever you can ... as long as they are Haitian.” British West Indians were also mentioned, but unlike Haitians the employer specified that such a worker was to be “a Jamaican who is purely a laborer.” The statement illustrates the common practice in which British West Indians, despite their different islands of origin, were often called “Jamaicans.” Unlike Haitians, they were not considered “pure laborers” and would correspondingly perform tasks other than cane cutting (Chailloux Laffita & Whitney 2005:57, McLeod 2000:82-84, Wynter 2001:240). Haitians, on the other hand, required no contingencies. They were ipso facto cane cutters. Thus, it was believed, Haitians were relegated to cutting sugarcane as other groups refused or moved into other occupations.

The ideal plantation labor hierarchy, on which Haitians were said to inhabit the lowest rung, holds strong parallels with slavery in Cuban society. Despite the technological and organizational transformations in the Cuban sugar industry in the period after abolition, the task and organization of cutting cane stalks in the fields did not change noticeably (Dye 1998, García Rodríguez 2007, Moreno Fraginals 1964:98). Furthermore, as Carpentier’s text shows, Haitians were associated with barracones, the barracks that were built to house slaves during the apex of Cuban slave society. Manuel Moreno Fraginals (1978:74) called them “the maximum symbol of slavery’s...
The association between Haitians and slavery was so strong that some Cubans believe that it was Haitians who had brought the *barracones* to Cuba. The national press contributed to consolidating this association, referring to Haitians as the only workers who would perform the labor that former slaves had been forced to do. Even middle-class Haitians referred to the migratory movement in terms of slavery, such as Haitian writer Lélio Laville’s (1933) characterization of it as a “20th Century Slave Trade.”

Cuban newspapers and sugar companies produced an image of Haitians as ideal cane cutters because they were primitive and lacked the skills that “races of a superior civilization” possessed. The strong association between cutting cane and slave labor further reinforced the notion that Haitians were twentieth-century slaves subject to managerial domination. As a result, Haitians were thought to be culturally isolated from the rest of Cuban society. Carpentier (2002:66) says it succinctly through his Afro-Cuban protagonist who “felt strange among so many blacks with other customs and languages ... The Haitians were animals and savages!”

The image of the isolated Haitian cane cutter has survived, albeit in modified form, in contemporary historiography, which has echoed many of the statements produced by Cuban nationalists, the press, and company administrators from the 1910s and 1920s. Scholars argue that Haitians’ low literacy rates, inability to speak English, non-Christian religious practices, and lack of labor-related skills made them less likely than British West Indians to move up in sugar hierarchies or out of sugar work entirely (McLeod 1998:609, Zanetti & Garcia 1976:246). Others argue that cultural differences between Cubans and foreigners, along with ubiquitous racism, kept Haitians apart from other groups. “Haitians were segregated in social relations. To the Haitian immigrant, marginalization was applied with the most crudeness, not just by white components of society, but even Cuban mestizos and blacks who rejected them” (Gómez Navia 2005:15). Others point to Haitians’ minimal participation in labor unions as proof of their isolation from other workers (Zanetti & Garcia 1976:248). Indeed, though scholars have studied the labor mobilizations of Afrocubans, British West Indians, and other

15. See also Sklodowska 2009:66-68.
immigrant groups (Giovannetti 2006a, Scott 2005), there is considerably less discussion of the organizational efforts of Haitian immigrants.  

HAITIANS’ LABOR IN THE CUBAN SUGAR INDUSTRY

The most recent scholarship on labor history and the Cuban sugar industry illustrates the risks of assuming that the Cuban national press or company administrators’ goals accurately reflect the reality of life on plantations. Historians have argued that many Cuban nationalist statements about the unbridled power of U.S.-owned sugar companies often oversimplified complex negotiations that occurred at the local level between state officials, company representatives, small farmers, and others. They also challenge the extent to which sugar companies were fully able to control or segregate their workers (Carr 1998b:262, Giovannetti 2006b:19, McGillivray 2009:118-21, 161-63).

Although the label “Haitian” carried strong connotations of cane cutters for journalists and company officials, it was not necessarily coterminous with a person born in Haiti (or one of their descendants) (McGillivray 2009:113). Company administrators often applied the term to denote any poor, black, seasonal cane cutter regardless of actual birthplace or national identity. In 1919, for instance, Everett C. Brown, a United Fruit Company engineer, wrote to his wife:

> There is talk of an insurrection but don’t take much stock in it. There may be some damage done to property in some sections. The *Haitian cane cutters* will get back from Porto Rico [sic] and South America then and they may start something, but the Cubans are too well off to do it [emphasis added].

Brown’s statement reduces a complex hemispheric circulation of laborers from different parts of the Americas into a misleading category of “Haitian cane cutters.” Besides reinforcing stereotypes about Haitians’ poverty, propensity to violence, and position as cane cutters, Brown’s statement clearly differentiates them from Cubans by declaring that unlike Haitians, “Cubans are too well off” to “start something.”

17. Everett C. Brown to Ethel and Susie Brown, October 11, 1919, University of Florida, Gainesville: Everett C. Brown Collection, Box 1, Folder 2-Cuba.
19. Everett C. Brown to Ethel and Susie Brown, October 11, 1919, University of Florida: Everett C. Brown Collection, Box 1, Folder 2-Cuba.
In many cases, individuals described as Haitians were not actually of that origin. In 1905, a Cuban mayoral referred to a group of cane cutters as “five black Haitians.”20 A Cuban capataz (foreman) identified them as José Gabriel, Octavio Posiná, José Figueroa, Plácido Belen, and José Louis, though he added that only “the first two and the last one [are] Haitians.”21 For those who did not know laborers personally, all seasonal cane cutters could be described as Haitians. The result is that plantation managers’ control and Haitians’ marginalization were both frequently overstated. Although most Haitian-born individuals cut cane, they also performed other types of labor on sugar plantations. Haitians served as labor recruiters for sugar firms seeking to attract labor away from other companies. These individuals gathered at railroad stations when cane cutters were being transported to “try to bring them to other centrales.”22 D. Beauville Ferailler, a Haitian, received a salary from the United Fruit Company to work in this capacity.23 Outside of cutting cane, one of the most common jobs for Haitians on sugar plantations was transporting cane from field to factory. As early as 1917, Haitian-born José Miguel drove oxen on the United Fruit Company plantation in Banes.24 Haitians worked inside the centrales where cane stalks were converted into sugar granules, sites previously considered to have been off limits to Haitians, just as they had been to previous generations of slaves (Knight 1970:71). After cane was brought into the central of the Fidelity Sugar Company, Marcos Santiago lifted and transported it to begin the process of transformation.25 After

23. Labor Recruiting Certificate for D. Beauville Ferailler signed by Rafael Barceló y Reyes, Gobernador de la Provincia de Oriente, March 14, 1930, APSPG 311/20/1. Other examples include Odellon Placido and Prevenio Laine who recruited cane cutters for the Cuban-Canadian Sugar Company. Sub-administrador, Cuban-Canadian Sugar Company, SA to Gobernador de la Provincia de Oriente, November 25, 1927, APSPG 309/12/1. Labor Recruiting Certificate for Prevenio Laine signed by Fernando Cuesta y Mora, Secretario de la Administración Provincial de Oriente, December 3, 1927, APSGP 309/15/2.
the juice was extracted from cane stalks in the central San German, Enrique Simon worked with the bagasse (leftover parts of cane stalks), which could be burned for fuel. In the central Tacajó, Estrad Avignon worked in the boiler house where cane juice was heated to eliminate impurities. Maeny Sterling and Andres Domingo worked in the centrifuges in the central San German crystallizing the sugar granules and separating them from the honey.

In these centrales, Haitian-born laborers worked alongside individuals of other nationalities, disproving the notion that companies were able to divide workers strictly along national lines. José Salas, a mason in the basculador in the central Tacajó, worked alongside Félix Dias, a laborer originally from Venezuela. In the same central, Alfredo Ayes worked as a carpenter with Jamaican-born Dean François. Antonio Luis worked with horses for the Fidelity Sugar Company with a Canary Islander named Antonio Hernandez. The aforementioned Estrad Avignon worked in the boilers in the central Tacajó with Francisco Weiner, an immigrant from Jamaica.

Although Haitians’ labor in centrales was more significant than previous historians recognize, the vast majority cut cane. Haitians were not the only nationalities represented in the cane fields. In a discussion of cane cutters, a representative from the Cuban American Sugar Mills Company described Grenada, St. Vincent, St. Kitts, Barbados, and Dominica as “our special preserve for labor recruiting,” suggesting that cane fields were hardly mono-ethnic sites. They were joined by Cubans as well as individuals from the Dutch- and French-speaking islands of the Caribbean (McGillivray
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2009:175). Like their counterparts in *centrales*, Haitian cane cutters worked alongside individuals of other nationalities. In Guantánamo in 1933, Haitian-born Andres Felix cut cane alongside Julio Maturrell and Fructuoso Mendoza, two Cubans whom he knew personally.34

Popular representations of Haitians as unskilled manual laborers fail to recognize the fact that cane cutting is a skill that Haitians had acquired before landing in Cuba.35 H.M. Pilkington, an employee of the American Development Company in Haiti, noted: “a very large percentage of the vast number of people ... who migrated from Haiti to Cuba as skilled cane cutters were educated in this line by the Haitian-American Sugar Co.”36

Cane cutters were also divided by formal and informal hierarchies in the cane fields. Haitian-born Luis Agosto, like individuals of other nationalities, served as a *capataz* in the cane fields.37 In addition to cutting cane, these individuals directed other workers in the field and often served as liaisons between laborers and police. On the *colonia* San Ramon in 1936, a conflict between two Haitian workers resulted in the wounding of one by a gunshot. Antonio Pie, the Haitian-born *capataz*, arrived at the scene of the fight before the police and spoke to both workers. Although Pie did not witness the events, he explained the details to the authorities, who accepted his narrative and did not take testimony from the individuals involved.38 *Capataces* also received higher wages than other cane cutters. The aforementioned *capataz* Luis Agosto received approximately $2.00 a day during the 1930 harvest. In the same month on the same *colonia*, Ignacio Cuba, another Haitian cane cutter, received only $1.50.39

Alongside company hierarchies were unofficial markers of status recognized by workers themselves. Most notably, experienced cane cutters who achieved relative success in Cuba often called themselves viejos (old men) (Pérez de la Riva 1979:51). This nickname also appears in Haitian novels

34. “Instructiva del Acusado: Andres Felix y no Pie,” April 30, 1932; “Declaración de Julio Maturrell,” May 1, 1933; “Declaración de Fructuoso Mendoza.” April 1, 1933; Juzgado de Instrucción de Guantánamo, Archivo Provincial de Santiago: Audiencia Territorial de Oriente (hereafter APSATO), 348/2544/6, 10-1.
35. For a brief description of the process of cutting cane and the skill involved, see McGillivray 2009:3.
and newspapers in the period to describe return-migrants who wore nice clothes and carried money.\textsuperscript{40} Haitian workers who self-identified using the Spanish word \textit{viejo} demanded better treatment and labor conditions, implying that they had achieved a higher status within Cuban society than other cane cutters. For instance, Haitian-born Juan Bautista, although only twenty-four years old, declared that “he was already very \textit{viejo} in Cuba” to explain his refusal to travel to a distant field and work during his leisure hours.\textsuperscript{41}

Despite pervasive accusations in the Cuban press to the contrary, most historians argue that Haitians received the same wages as native workers for similar activities. Alejandro Garcia and Oscar Zanetti support this thesis, although they hypothesize that when the sugar industry declined and anti-immigrant sentiments reached their peak, “it’s possible that the [United Fruit] Company took advantage of the situation by some measure and paid lower salaries” to immigrant laborers (Zanetti & Garcia 1976:247). In fact, available individual wage data suggests the merits of their hypothesis and the need for further research on this subject. In periods of stable prices and normal sugar production, Haitians and laborers of other nationalities appear to have received the same wages. During the 1919 \textit{zafra}, both Haitian and Jamaican cane cutters received $3.00 per day on United Fruit Company fields. During the harvest of 1933, Jamaican laborer Charles Mani received 40 cents for every 100 \textit{arrobas} of cane cut from the Cuba Company. Haitians working for the same company, however, received only 20 cents.\textsuperscript{42}

Although cane cutters received the lowest wages on company pay scales, they worked longer hours than other employees on the plantation. Everett Brown, a United Fruit Company engineer from the United States, explained to his wife that he worked eight hours a day “from 7-11 a.m.: 1-5 pm in the office.” \textit{Mayorales} and other field managers began their day at six in the morning and worked for nine hours. “The niggers,” he said “[w]ork 10 hours a day.”\textsuperscript{43} In other places, it could be as long as fourteen hours (Guanche & Moreno 1988:28).

\textsuperscript{40} “En deux mots,” \textit{La Garde}, June 27, 1937. See also Kaussen 2008:xii, 114, as well as Jean Batiste Cinéas’s \textit{Le drame de la terre} (2004) or Maurice Casseus’s \textit{Viejo} (1970), originally published in 1933 and 1935, respectively.


\textsuperscript{42} Accident Report for Charles Mani, March 6, 1933, APHJPI 303/5654/1, 15. Accident Report for Santiago Pérez, February 20, 1933, APHJPI 303/5643/1, 13. Accident Report for José Domingo, February 24, 1933, APHJPI 303/5645/1. Accident Report for Emilio Pol, March 2, 1933, APHJPI 303/5649/1, 12, 15.

\textsuperscript{43} Everett C. Brown to Ethel and Susie Brown, August 17, 1919, University of Florida: Everett C. Brown Collection, Box 1, Folder 2-Cuba.
Cutting cane is a strenuous and onerous activity even in optimal conditions. As groups of men repeatedly swung their machetes for long hours, accidents were common. While cutting or cleaning cane, shards of cane stalk and pieces of wood flew into the air and hit workers’ faces and bodies. After detaching stalks from the ground, workers grabbed them for further chopping and trimming, sometimes grasping hidden thorns and piercing their hands. At other moments, workers missed their targets, producing painful machete slices on legs, arms, and fingers. Finally, the day’s sweat was often enough to send the machete flying out of workers’ hands entirely, causing injury to themselves or others.\textsuperscript{44}

The inherent difficulties of cutting cane on a massive scale were compounded for Haitians and workers of other nationalities by company abuse. One of the most notorious examples of sugar company abuse was the payment of workers with \textit{vales} (vouchers) instead of cash. In 1923, Cuban officials complained that sugar companies were distributing \textit{vales} “instead of daily wages” which workers were forced to use “to buy merchandise” in company stores. Although such practices had been outlawed in 1909, sugar and other companies continued circulating them throughout the Republican period.\textsuperscript{45} At other moments, company and state officials showed their utter disregard for Haitian laborers. In 1923, Haitian worker Edgard Zéphyr “was killed by a train loaded with cane.” Rather than reporting the accident, Zéphyr was “buried during the night by the Police.”\textsuperscript{46} The fact that these abuses were investigated, however, suggests that the control of company and state officials was not unlimited.

The life of sugar workers was often marked by poverty, hunger, and harsh conditions. In 1922, Haitian Julio Pie was “without work and hungry,” when he tried to drown himself by jumping off a dock into water in Santiago de Cuba.\textsuperscript{47} In Guantánamo in August 1928 an unknown Haitian worker died of bronchitis because he was “without any of the necessary resources for its treatment.”\textsuperscript{48} Haitians were not the only sugar workers to experience such

\textsuperscript{44} All of these injuries appear with frequency among cane cutters of various nationalities in Accident Reports in APHJPI.


\textsuperscript{46} Edmond Laporte to Gobernador Provincial de Oriente, January 12, 1923, APSGP 376/14/1.


\textsuperscript{48} “En la finca ‘Chapala’ fallece un haitiano sin asistencia médica,” \textit{La Voz del Pueblo}, August 15, 1928.
hardships. When the central Almeida announced it would only grind limited amounts of cane in 1928, people in the area “feared the phantasm of hunger would appear as soon as the mill ceased its labors.”49 In the 1930s, when conditions in the sugar industry were depressed throughout the country, a newspaper reported that the central Almeida was not even solvent enough to pay its employees. As a result “many workers have died of hunger.”50 One U.S. observer noted how poverty hit some groups harder than others. When “the valley was filled with hunger. The Americans, we ate well. Those who suffered most were Antilleans and Cubans” (Cirules 2003:175-76).51

**IMPROVING WORKING AND LIVING CONDITIONS OUTSIDE FORMAL LABOR UNIONS**

Despite difficult work conditions, historians have shown that Haitians only rarely participated in organized labor.52 However, labor historians have located forms of “everyday resistance” outside of the “organized, large-scale, protest movements” of labor unions or revolutionary movements in other historical contexts (Scott 1985:xv, 27). Although often silenced from the historical record, such actions subverted total company domination and dominant discourses while greatly affecting workers’ living and laboring conditions.53 Indeed, although participation in formal labor unions among Haitians seems to have been minimal, they developed individual and collective strategies to navigate the harsh work environment of the Cuban sugar industry and take full advantage of their leisure hours.

In Cuba, one of the primary ways for sugar laborers to exert control over their labor was to burn cane. This eliminated excess growth and made cutting it much easier. It also created immediate work since burned cane had to be processed quickly (McGillivray 2009:2-3). There is evidence that Haitians resorted to cane burning when it was convenient to them. In Esmeralda, Camagüey, during the harvest of 1936, Haitian laborer Alberto Pie, whose nickname “Vijuel” was probably a derivation of viejo, approached the colono whose land he was working. “In representation of his fellow workers,” Vijuel

49. “Los vecinos del central Almeida temen que aparezca el fantasma del hambre cuando cese sus labores el ingenio,” Diario de Cuba, March 22, 1928.


51. See also: “Los vecinos del central Almeida temen que aparezca el fantasma del hambre cuando cese sus labores el ingenio,” Diario de Cuba, March 22, 1928.


“made a demand to burn the cane, since they were dealing with old cane” that “had a lot of straw” on it. Such cane “is cut with difficulty and easier to cut when burned.” The request to lighten the workload was denied. Fifteen days later, the colonia went up in flames. The fire quickly spread to neighboring farms and burned approximately 70,000 arrobas of cane. The rural guard was quick to arrest both Vijuel and Avilio Mila, another Haitian. Surprisingly, the landowner and manager defended the Haitian workers. Walfredo Abreu Delgado, the administrator of the land, told the Rural Guard that he thought the fire was “intentional, but he didn’t suspect the detainees” since “they have worked in said colonia for many years.” Both Alberto Pie (Vijuel) and Avilio Mila were later acquitted of all charges.

If some Haitian cane cutters benefited from settling on farms for many years and creating personal relationships with colonos, others sought advantage by moving between farms and arguing for the best wages. In the cane fields surrounding the central Cupey in 1918, Haitian-born Julio Poll was accused of “creating resistance to the cutting of cane for the quantity of one peso and ten cents [$1.10].” He was “demanding an increase to the sum of one peso forty cents [$1.40]” and creating “an alteration of order amongst the cane cutters.” Poll denied the charges, claiming that he was singled out because he “set out for another colonia where they paid one peso forty cents [$1.40] for every cart of cane one cut.” Despite marked differences in their narratives of the events, it is clear that the conflict between Poll and the guard centered around issues of workers’ freedom of movement and wage rates. In this case, a physical fight broke out between the two. Poll claimed that the company’s private guard “gave him four slaps with a machete [planazos] in the back” when he tried to leave the cane field. Other witnesses declare that Poll “seized a rock, throwing it over Captain Charles.” Meanwhile, they claimed, Poll’s Haitian-born companion Javier Santiago “pulled out a knife and fell upon [the guard] with it.” This was one of many cases in which Haitians and other immigrant laborers physically resisted companies’ efforts to keep them from

57. Sugar workers’ tendency to move was first studied in detail in Carr 1996b.
leaving plantations in the middle of *zafras.* In Jatibonico in March 1925, “a group of Haitians and Jamaicans besieged a pair of rural guards in the *colonia* Victoria,” most likely over the right to move between plantations.

Workers’ movements between plantations were also facilitated by Haitian migrants who became labor recruiters. Though sugar companies hired them to attract field laborers to their plantations, recruiters generally invited scorn from other sugar companies, state officials, and even laborers themselves. An administrator for the Palma Sugar Company complained that when their agents “bring workers for cane cutting from Santiago de Cuba, they are bothered by elements that congregate in the train station, making a dreadful, calumnious and cruel propaganda that, for example, the workers in this *Central* are badly treated and hit with machetes.” State and company officials believed that such individuals were merely trying to steal laborers and “bring them to other *centrales.*” At other moments labor recruiters “penetrated within the limits of distinct farms, conquering the laborers there with promises of higher wages, in order to bring them to other *centrales*.” The Cuban government even passed a law in 1926 requiring recruiters to register with the Cuban state.

Such mobile recruiters could act as a source of information for migrant laborers about work conditions on distant plantations. However, evidence shows their penchant for fraud and migrants’ disillusionment with their false promises. Haitian-born Coclès Simon was a labor recruiter for the Francisco Sugar Company. In addition to attracting Haitians to labor there, Simon falsely claimed to be “a delegate of [the Haitian] consulate,” in order “to exploit” the “Haitians in the countryside.” Resentment against labor recruiters becomes obvious during a fight between a Haitian worker and a rural guardsman at the United Fruit Company. In the middle of the fight, the worker told the guard to “fuck your mother and the mother of the labor contractor.”

64. “Contra los tratantes de trabajadores,” *La Voz del Pueblo,* November 26, 1928.
65. Rafael Aguirre, Administrador de Palma Soriano Sugar Company to Guillermo F. Mascaro, Gobernador de Oriente, March 5, 1919, APSGP 307/21/1.
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Likewise, when a middle-class Haitian woman who was involved in labor recruiting in Haiti wanted to converse with some migrants in Cuba, one of them responded to her invitation by declaring that he would only meet her “if... she came to visit us and were to eat cane with us” (Laville 1933:11).

Sugar companies’ visions of Haitians were defined by the immigrants’ role as a productive labor force on plantations. The scholarly focus on Haitians as simply workers unwittingly reproduces this logic.71 Haitians’ lives, however, can hardly be reduced to their labor. Outside of work hours they sought to create their own social worlds. Written documents describing Haitians’ actions outside of the sites and hours of the workday are proportionally few compared to the psychological, social, and economic significance of such activities. Haitian immigrants’ overwhelming illiteracy, estimated at 90 percent, explains the dearth of sources written by migrants themselves (Pérez de la Riva 1979:table vii). Instead, historians must rely on company records and judicial archives. Although extensive and often detailed, these documents reflect very specific economic and political concerns. Haitians’ activities appear only when the goals of the company and state were breached, giving a necessarily limited picture of the world migrants created outside of the workday.

Notwithstanding their limitations, records of production and repression shed considerable light on migrants’ social and economic activities on sugar plantations before, during, and after the period of heavy repatriations. They reveal a world in which Haitian men and women relaxed and socialized after work, engaged in small-scale commerce, sold sex, gambled, and engaged in other non-sugar-producing activities on plantations as both providers and consumers. The networks involving Haitians and individuals of other nationalities that emerged out of their extensive interactions dispel the notion that sugar companies were able to divide their workforces effectively or that Haitians were socially isolated.

Samuel Martínez’s study of material culture on a contemporary sugar plantation in the Dominican Republic explains the importance of leisure time and the consumption of non-utilitarian goods, even for impoverished workers. Leisure, he argues, “takes on an importance wholly beyond its utility as a time to recuperate the energy to work again” because it “is the only time the worker fully possesses him/herself, and becomes fleetingly ‘sovereign.’” Similarly, consumption of non-essential goods may be used for achieving personal dignity, “reclaiming individuality,” and “gaining momentary relief from monotony and drudgery” (Martínez 2007:12, 52).

There is abundant evidence that Haitian workers sought relief from monotony and drudgery through various means. On the evening of March 7, 1919, for instance, Haitian-born Ney Louis Charles was drinking anisette and play-
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71. The obvious exceptions to this are the many studies of Haitian Vodou in Cuba. See James, Millet & Alarcón 1998.
ing his violin in a café on the United Fruit Company’s Preston plantation in Cuba. It was payday. During the evening, a Jamaican-born prostitute “asked him in English” to play a Haitian waltz. This was not a chance encounter; they knew each other very well. In fact, Charles and a Cuban-born member of the rural guard held a rivalry over her affections (Laville 1933:8-10). Charles’s story is just one example of how Haitian workers relaxed outside of the workday with music, drinking, dancing, and other activities. On an evening in May 1929, Haitian-born Luis Fis met with José Samuel, Salvador Pie, and José Pol Fisco outside the house of another Haitian, José Zayas. They had been paid for their labor earlier that day and drank late into the night.72

Nous Louis Charles’s relationships with the Jamaican prostitute and the Cuban rural guardsman also highlight the way individuals from different nationalities interacted in the hours and spaces outside of sugar production. This is consistent with the findings of other studies of Caribbean migrants, which argue that migrants’ “networks are based on quite another logic than nation-states, with their clearly demarcated borders, exclusive memberships based on birthrights, and strong ideology of shared common identity” (Fog-Olwig 2007:11). In a much later example of relationships that were not defined by national divisions, in 1947, Haitians José Leyva and Rapido Luis coordinated with two Afro-Cubans and a Barbadian to “invest their earnings in dances and bachatas they give in the colonia.”73

What for some was a reprieve from arduous work, others saw as an opportunity for economic advancement. In Cuba, as elsewhere in the Americas, the presence of a large agricultural workforce created demand for a range of goods and services readily filled by other inhabitants of plantations and nearby cities (McGillivray 2009:142, Putnam 2002:7). At the beginning of the sugar harvest of 1938, Haitian-born Tertulien Jutilien left his seasonal residence in Santiago de Cuba to “sell merchandise outside of the city.”74 Among his wares were dolls, cornets, toy guns, earrings, gray socks, books, and toothbrushes.75 In 1929, Haitian-born Rosa Pol sold “sweets” inside a barracón.

on the *colonia* Buena Vista in Palma Soriano.\textsuperscript{76} Through the informal commercial networks constituted by buyers and sellers, Haitians had contact with individuals of other nationalities. Jutilien lived with Maria Martinez, a woman originally from the Dominican Republic, who was also “accustomed to working in the countryside during the *zafras.*”\textsuperscript{77} William Stokes, an individual from the United States living in rural Cuba, recalled that one “could usually buy boxes of *boniato* from Haitians” (Cirules 2003:176). On the *colonia* San Carlos number 11 in Santa Cruz del Sur, Haitian-born Benito Luis purchased his cigarettes in a store run by a Jamaican-born merchant, Ignacio Montes.\textsuperscript{78}

Selling sex on plantations was another economic activity in which Haitian-born men and women engaged. In Palma Soriano in 1928, two Haitian-born individuals, Bertina Nicolasa and José Nicolás, worked as a prostitute and pimp respectively.\textsuperscript{79} Like sugar production and petty commerce, the network of prostitutes, their brokers, and their customers cut across national lines. In 1947, on the *colonia* Pennsylvania, Haitian-born José Leyva, along with another Haitian, a Barbadian, and two Cubans supplemented their work by “bringing women from other places to exercise prostitution so that they could appropriate the products that said women obtain.”\textsuperscript{80} In Leyva’s house there were two Cuban-born women, Clementina Pimentel Menendez and Marcela Martínez Rosell, who were “engaging in prostitution under [his] direction.”\textsuperscript{81} At times, inter-ethnic love triangles occurred, such as the aforementioned conflict between Ney Louis Charles and the Cuban rural guard over a Jamaican woman (Laville 1933:7-10). In 1942, Alberto Luis and Juan Cumber, a Haitian and Jamaican respectively, held a rivalry over an Afro-Cuban woman named Maria, who lived on their *colonia* and worked during the yearly harvests as a prostitute.\textsuperscript{82}

Haitian migrants also gambled in various forms on sugar plantations, including buying and selling lottery tickets. One observer hyperbolically declared that “there is no human being with more love for gambling than the Haitian.”\textsuperscript{83} On the *colonia* Demajagual in Camagüey, Haitian-born Antonio Luis was known as an “individual who does not work and when he does only
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dedicates himself to selling lottery tickets ... and gambling.”84 Besides selling lottery tickets, Haitians also bought them in large numbers. In 1937, observers blamed the widespread deportation of Haitian laborers for the “overwhelming” number of unsold lottery tickets in Guantánamo.85 Despite the inevitable drain on the majority of Haitians’ already low wages, there are reasons gambling could be appealing to workers in such harsh conditions, for “gambling suspends compliance not only with the mathematical but also with the political and social orthodoxies governing everyday life” (Kavanagh 2005:11).

Haitians were not the only individuals on Cuban soil who gambled. Gambling was common among all social classes in all regions of Republican Cuba (Sáenz Rovner 2008). In fact, Haitians, Cubans, and individuals of other nationalities gambled together on sugar plantations, buttressing arguments that gambling is a “significant social practice,” and “a form of conviviality both anchored in and revelatory of its broader cultural context” (Kavanagh 2005:7). In Ciego de Avila in 1942, Haitian-born rural laborer Alberto Luis bought lottery tickets from Luis Woi Tung, a Chinese-born individual who lived on the same sugar plantation.86 As a result, Luis often borrowed money from Juan Cumber, a Jamaican-born rural worker who had “on many occasions ... given him medios y reales so that he could pay his bills.”87 Similarly, one day in 1928 in San Germán, Haitians José Ramón, José Manuel, and Antonio Segundo were gambling with a Dominican named José Martínez and Gabino Quial, a Cuban.88 Gambling was so common in sugar barracones that “gamblers from the cities ... make incursions in the colonias” to play. Among them was Antonio Fadragas, a white middle-class Cuban who gambled with Adolfo Estévez Cardenas, a “black” of unknown nationality in the colonia Montada in Morón, Camagüey.89

Haitian men and women also reproduced family structures and divided domestic labor on sugar plantations, though such activities have largely been ignored by previous historians. Haitian families cooperated to prepare food, wash clothes, and perform other domestic duties during leisure hours. In the colonia Fontanales number 3, Lucia Pradela, a married Haitian woman, performed domestic labor in her house.90 Domestic labor was probably not the only work such women performed. In 1929, the aforementioned Rosa Pol

87. “Declaración de Juan Cumber (soa),” July 14, 1942, APCTU 25/1/Pieza no. 1, p. 10.
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90. “Declaración de Lucia Pradela (soa),” July 17, 1942, APCTU 25/1/Pieza no. 1, p. 44.
told authorities that she worked in her house, though she also sold food in the barracones. Nor was all such labor performed by women. During the dead season of 1926 on the colonia La Isabel, a group of Haitian men cooperated to cook, clean, and gather food. Simon Pie and José Luis, two Haitians who worked with oxen, left “from the barracón ... where they lived and worked, to the store on the colonia to buy soap.” At that point, they separated and divided their work. Pie traveled “to the ravine to wash their clothing” while “Luis returned to the aforementioned barracón to make lunch for both” as well as for Luis’s father who “had gone to look for boniato” on a distant colonia. Even such close-knit cooperation among Haitians did not prevent them from forming relationships with people of other nationalities. When Simon Pie was injured, Obdulio Celasio, an individual from Curaçao, alerted Pie’s companions and aided them in seeking medical attention. In another case, in 1924, Cuban-born Eliodoro Hechavarría cooked in a small restaurant on the colonia Barrancas that was patronized by Haitian workers.

Encroachments on Haitians’ efforts to take advantage of their leisure time, exert control over their labor, and diversify their economic activities came from company and state representatives acting in official capacity to maintain the economic interests of the former and enforce the laws of the latter. At times, sugar companies tolerated gambling and prostitution on plantations in order to retain workers, even as state officials cracked down on them, questioning the extent to which Cuban state institutions acted on behalf of sugar companies. Company tolerance evaporated, however, when Haitians’ labor and leisure strategies conflicted with their economic interests or desire to control their laborers. As a result, conflicts broke out between workers and representatives of companies and the state over the terms of labor and leisure.

El Camagueyano declared very bluntly in 1924 that “in a colonia in the interior with no women and only a little gambling from time to time, you will probably not find any workers.” In the central Baguanos and elsewhere, rural guardsmen even accepted bribes from known gamblers in exchange for the right to play. The state was less obliging. Undercover police officers arrested men and women from different nationalities for illegal gambling or engaging in prostitution. In the realm of gambling, Haitians and other workers often
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opposed police attempts to stop their games, leading to physical confrontations. In 1942, Julian Castillo, a Haitian-born individual who sold lottery tickets for a living, was approached by a police officer. Rather than surrender his list of numbers, Castillo “resisted it, not wanting to accompany [the guard].”

Similarly, undercover agents sought to arrest Haitian-born Antonio López on the assumption that he and another were running an illegal numbers game on the colonia Ambición. López responded with violence, insults, and assertions of his masculinity. In addition to “brandishing the machete he was carrying,” he told the guard “not to touch him that he was no woman and that if they touched him he would kill one of them.” At that moment, agents showed him their identification cards, to which López responded by thrusting his machete in their faces and telling them they could “wipe their asses” with them.

Rather than physically resisting arrest, the Haitian men and women accused of prostitution responded by claiming other occupations. Cuban-born Marcela Martínez Rosel denied being a prostitute to authorities. Instead, she claimed to work within her house as the “cousin sister [prima hermana] of José Leiva,” the Haitian-born individual accused of making money with her sex. Clemencia Pimentel Menendez, another accused, similarly declared that Leiva “was a friend of [hers] for a very long time.” Men and women also asserted that the men only engaged in honorable work and did not need to sell women’s sex for money. Rather than depending on the sex work of Victoria Domínguez, Haitian-born Rápido Luis claimed that he “maintains her with all of the products of his work, which is cutting cane and other jobs in the colonias.”

Despite some employers’ tolerance of activities like gambling and selling sex, Haitians faced opposition when their efforts to relax or diversify their economic activities conflicted with company goals of productivity. In 1929, Haitian-born Juan Bautista defied United Fruit Company orders to travel to a distant field to cut cane. In his own words, he “had drunk some cups of liquor, which made him a little drunk.” As a result, “he did not want to go and work and was in the barracón looking for a way to go and find food, because the animals or some unknown person ate what he had made.” As guards approached him, a verbal and physical fight broke out. A Jamaican cook reported that “Bautista was talking a lot and saying that he wouldn’t work in

102. “Comparecencia del Acusado Juan Batista s.o.a.,” May 28, 1929, ANCAS 29/1/13.
the non-company fields.”103 The officer claimed that Bautista had reached for his knife while resisting arrest “with an aggressive attitude,” requiring him to “use force.”104

Wandering merchants were accused by both urban shopkeepers and sugar company officials of undercutting prices of permanent stores.105 They were often physically harassed by rural guards and expelled from sugar plantations. According to a complaint by a group of wandering merchants, companies used the most “reprehensible measures” to stop them. Typically “the Guarda Jurado [private company guards] arrives at the place where the vendor is, which is always a public place, before telling them that they cannot continue there because it is prohibited by ‘the Company.’” When vendors asserted their right to sell by pointing out that “it’s not private property ... the guarda jurado scatters the merchandise, mistreats him in words and deeds and then accuses him of disobedience and assault.” In 1924 on the central Miranda, Salvador Bhar, a Cuban-born wandering merchant “was attacked brutally by a Guarda Jurado” merely for selling goods on company premises.106

CONCLUSION

In Republican Cuba, Haitians were identified as a homogenous group of cane cutters who remained at the bottom of labor hierarchies and were effectively segregated from other workers by the managerial policies of sugar companies. In actuality, Haitian laborers on Cuban sugar plantations were neither relegated to the lowest position on Cuba’s labor hierarchy nor isolated from individuals of other nationalities. Although most Haitian immigrants cut cane, they also worked as labor recruiters and ox-drivers. They even labored in the industrial sectors in sugar centrales. In all of these activities, they were part of a heterogeneous workforce that was never fully segregated along national lines, despite companies’ efforts to the contrary. Although Haitians rarely participated in labor unions, they developed individual and collective strategies to resist company control over their labor and leisure. While some of these strategies involved taking actions during work hours, many others occurred during breaks in the workday. Haitians and individuals of other nationalities created social and economic worlds outside the direct gaze of company and state. Despite periodic attempts by state and company offi-

106. “La denuncia de los vendedores ambulantes,” Diario de Cuba, August 29, 1924.
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cials to stop them, Haitians actively sought to take advantage of their leisure hours and diversify their economic activities. This included drinking, relaxing, playing music, dancing, engaging in prostitution, gambling, petty commerce, and other activities with workers of other nationalities. The picture that emerges as we get closer to the experiences of Haitian migrants themselves is one of multinational exchanges and links, not one of workers rigidly divided according to ethnicity. It suggests that discussions of Haitian integration into Cuban society should begin in the communities they formed with Cubans and other immigrants, not the top-down policies of the Cuban state.
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In the last decades of the nineteenth century, West Indians traveled up and down the North and South Atlantic in search of employment and favorable living conditions. By the middle of the following century, several hundred thousand Barbadians, Jamaicans, Trinidadians, Haitians, and others from smaller islands in the Leeward Isles had left their homes and found work in the expanding tropical export economies and the adjoining railway projects that had been designed to transport commodities in Central America. Others obtained service-related jobs in the newly discovered oil fields of Venezuela or the Canal Zone in Panama. This massive migration extended the scope of the Caribbean as laborers formed communities, introduced their folk cultures, and reconstituted families in these new host societies, which were often hostile to black and brown denizens. Opportunities abroad attracted industrious and erudite men and women seeking to utilize their professional skills and attain favorable living conditions by tapping into a long-established migratory network outside the confines of the agro-export boom in the Spanish-speaking circum-Caribbean.

Academic interest in West Indian migration to Latin America has been extensive. While scholars have examined the economic impact of migration on migrants’ home societies, have analyzed the interplay between labor and national politics as Spanish American political elites initially encouraged Afro-Caribbean workers to and later restricted them from entering their countries, and have explored the labor organization of North American corporations such as the United Fruit Company, they have paid less attention to the...
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fact that many West Indian migrants settled into communities with an already established Anglophone Afro-Caribbean population. Locales like Bocas del Toro (Panama), Cahuita and Turtle Bogue (Costa Rica), Pearl Lagoon and Bluefields (Nicaragua), and the islands of San Andrés and Providence (Colombia) may have been known to West Indian newcomers due not only to nearby employment opportunities they offered, but also to longtime contact between these sites and the Eastern Caribbean, particularly Jamaica (Troy 1967:55-57). However, scholars of this migration to Central America have often conflated British West Indians and these Anglophone residents of full and partial African ancestry, treating them as a single group and leaving the impression that the English-speaking black population was relatively new to the area. On the contrary, these Anglophone communities with ties to the West Indies have existed since the eighteenth century, becoming the depository for additional emigrants from the Greater and Lesser Antilles from the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries.

This paper focuses on one of these communities – the Archipelago of San Andrés and Providence – which is culturally and physically wedged between the Anglophone Caribbean and Spanish America. Lying less than one hundred miles from the Atlantic littoral of Central America, the islands are under the jurisdiction of the republic of Colombia nearly four hundred miles away. In an area settled largely by retired Anglo-Dutch buccaneers, itinerant farmers, and enslaved Africans in the late eighteenth century, residents conceded their loyalty first to the Spanish Crown and later to New Granada authorities in the aftermath of the Spanish American independence wars. Notwithstanding their political affiliation to Colombia, the social and economic development of the islands mirrored that of other places in the Greater Caribbean. Island planters sold their cotton, and fishermen peddled their turtle shells and meat mostly to a few Jamaican merchants en route to Central America in exchange for manufactured goods. They also educated their children in Jamaica and traveled throughout the region as seamen. By the 1870s, however, a steady trickle of mostly British West Indians began to relocate to the islands, scouting the area to acquire better livelihoods. By 1912, one census indicated that this group constituted nearly 5 percent of the total population; however, the profile of these migrants differed from


4. The census taker reported 3,123 inhabitants on San Andrés and 208 of them foreigners, mostly of West Indian extraction. On Providence, the total population was 1,930
that of their counterparts elsewhere due to their professions and educational comportment.

In this essay, I answer three interrelated questions. Who were these migrants, what attracted them to the Colombian islands, and what is revealed about West Indian migration as well as the scope of the Greater Caribbean in studying this lesser-known case? Drawing on travel accounts, newspapers, port records, and published and unpublished interviews, I examine the migratory circuit between the British Caribbean and the Archipelago of San Andrés and Providence. In so doing, I put forth a three-part argument. First, British West Indian migration was an organic result of long-term contact between the inhabitants of these Colombian islands and those of the Greater Antilles, in particular Jamaica. Second, although the migrants to the islands were mostly professionals such as attorneys, pharmacists, teachers, and ministers, there were also a few semi-skilled workers among them. Third and finally, their presence on the islands was less hostile, as local notables actively recruited and encouraged migrants to start businesses or provide services deemed desirable to the entire community. As such, their experiences represent a departure from the master narrative involving racist white American company officers, resentful local Hispanic laborers, and Spanish American political elites concerned about the economic and social future of their nations.

BETWEEN THE ANGLOPHONE CARIBBEAN AND SPANISH AMERICA:
A CARIBBEAN BORDERLAND

Territorial competition between England and Spain birthed borderlands in the western Caribbean. Although the Spanish claimed San Andrés and Providence islands in 1510, the Spanish empire later abandoned these lands in favor of colonization of the western and Pacific highlands of Central America. A deep desire for gold pushed conquistadores to search for areas rich in resources and human capital, but imperial Spain found colonization difficult along the Caribbean lowlands of Central America due to the area’s tricky terrain of swamps, jungles, and mountains as well as the hostile indigenous populations that resided there. By the seventeenth century, European competition for American colonies soared as first Anglo-Dutch buccaneers and then English Puritans came to Providence Island, establishing a settlement in 1631. Although the colonists initially recruited European indentured servants to grow tobacco, they later turned to enslaved Africans to cultivate cotton when conflicts erupted over land ownership and tobacco prices fell.

with 63 foreigners identified. See Santiago Guerrero to María Pedro Carreño, July 8, 1912, Ministerio de Gobierno, Sección Primera, Tomo 698, Folio 468, Archivo General de la Nación (hereafter AGN), Bogotá, Colombia.
Despite changes in labor and production, the Puritan colony was doomed. In addition to insufficient security that left settlers vulnerable to outside interlopers, slave uprisings, and slave escapes, the Puritans faced competition from the Spanish, who finally succeeded in driving the settlers off the island a decade after their arrival (Kupperman 1995:338).

Spain had little interest in colonizing these islands, and Spanish official policy in this area was aimed at warding off further foreign incursion from Anglo-Dutch pirates. As the islands offered few enticing resources, Spanish royal officials found it difficult to populate the islands with loyal subjects and eventually relied on itinerant foreigners. While they attempted to settle some twenty Canary Island families to deter further migration of English woodcutters to San Andrés Island, reports continued to note the presence of English-speaking settlers (Parsons 1956:14, Peralta 1890:66). Reliance on foreign settlers was a Spanish policy that had been used in other borderlands in North America and the Caribbean coastal lands of Central America with little success (Adelman & Aron 1999:825-26, Dawson 1998:69-70). By the late eighteenth century, some 35 settlers of mostly English and some Dutch extraction resided on the island of San Andrés along with 285 slaves after gaining permission to remain loyal subjects of Spain. In exchange for their obedience and conversion to Catholicism, royal officials permitted these settlers to remain on the islands to pursue cotton cultivation, fishing, and smuggling of British goods to the Central American mainland, leaving them without a strong government presence or means of communication with Spanish authorities (Cabrera Ortiz 1980:58-59).

Existing evidence, mostly from travel accounts, offers a glimpse into the social structure of San Andrés and Providence. The most affluent islanders were sea captains of small trading vessels, large landowners, and a few traders who served as middlemen in the sale of coconuts, oranges, turtle shell, and other goods sent to Jamaica and North America. Broadly speaking, these men and their families were the descendants of the first itinerant white settlers and their black and brown (racially mixed) wives and mistresses. On San Andrés, these families included the Bents, Bowies, Corpuses, Forbeses, Livingstons, and Mays; on Providence, the Archholds, Newballs, Robinsons, and Howards were among them (Desir 1989:101, Petersen 1989:95). The remainder of the population was composed of smallholders and fishermen who survived on their garden plots, fishing, and occasional work as sailors or day laborers.

Insight into the internal dynamics of the group is difficult to develop. It is clear, however, that skin color was one of many factors determining an islander’s social status within the community. Some families married across color lines, while others followed strict codes of color segregation. One American traveler stranded on Providence described the wife of the chief magistrate as “black as the aces spade.” His further encounters with islanders led him to surmise that Providence was a paradise for free blacks in the United
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States, as albeit islanders felt blessed “to be whitish ... they do not seem to feel it a degradation to be dark-skinned” (Stilman 1877:270, 273). Yet his optimistic portrayal of color relations is tempered by examples of enforced segregation and even strong animosity toward people of color. In the 1810s, American captain and trader Jacob Dunham noted that there were bad feelings between white and free colored residents on San Andrés, observing that white islanders took great pains to keep social events segregated. None of the colored (or brown) families had been invited to a ball "except an old man, by the name of Bent, the wealthiest man on the Island, owning about ninety slaves, whom the whites dare not overlook” (Dunham 1850:110).\(^5\)

Fifty years later, these racial tensions persisted. In 1862, white residents strongly criticized Baptist minister Philip Beekman Livingston, Jr. for marrying Josephine Pomare, a black woman who had served as a domestic servant and caretaker of the pastor’s first wife until her death three years earlier (Petersen 2001:95). While it is not clear whether these island parishioners objected to the matrimony due to racial chauvinism or moral concerns (i.e., suspicion of an inappropriate relationship during his wife’s illness), like the earlier white-only social event, wealth and not skin color appears to have been the decisive factor.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, San Andrés and Providence islanders had joined the republic of Gran Colombia. Colombian officials, like their Spanish predecessors centuries before them, neglected the islands for more critical issues impacting the mainland. The Gran Colombian government initially appointed a military commander to govern the islands, a post he served until 1833, when a civilian *jefe político* replaced him. Then the islands became a canton – a small administrative entity – administered by the government of Cartagena until 1868, when the islands were named one of six national territories to be governed under federal rule (Rausch 1993:89). This designation constituted an acknowledgment of the archipelago’s strategic importance. In 1867, Colombian intellectual and journalist José María Samper argued that the islands “are of the greatest importance by virtue of their position in the middle of the Panama Isthmus, the islands of Cuba and Jamaica and the coasts of Central America. They need the presence of the federal authority, making it felt directly and energetically.”\(^6\)

Despite such statements regarding the significance of these Caribbean islands to Colombia, the state presence there remained very weak. A small number of federal officials lived in the archipelago to administer the islands
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5. Providence islanders informed an anthropologist of similar social divisions at public events into the second half of the twentieth century, see Desir 1989:102.
for the national government; islanders filled most local public offices.\(^7\) Mainland authorities expressed concern about the governability of a population whose members did not understand Spanish and, as a result, failed to understand Colombian laws and thus could not carry out the demands of citizenship or even local administration (Vergara y Velasco 1888:88). Intense contention erupted between islanders and federal authorities from the mainland, which led to the shooting and murder of federal officials.\(^8\)

The 1880s brought significant changes to the islands’ administration and relationship to mainland Colombia. The ascent of Rafael Nuñez to power meant the replacement of extreme federalism with centralism. The Constitution of 1886 transferred all national territories back to their original departments – in the case of San Andrés and Providence, to the Department of Bolívar (Gibson 1951:59). Under this new administrative arrangement, departmental governors appointed prefects and other functionaries to govern the islands. Penury, poor management, and allegations of corruption soon plagued departmental authorities, who struggled to bridge the cultural and linguistic gaps that separated them from islanders.

An 1890 report from Juan Ramírez, the prefect of San Andrés and Providence, offers insight into public administration on the islands. Ramírez informed the governor that the 3,000 island inhabitants were English-speaking Protestants and, like José María Samper three decades earlier, he urged the government to take the necessary steps to incorporate them into the nation. He explained that the islanders were “strangers” in Colombia, as they shared a language, a culture, and even commercial interests with people in the United States. Ramírez feared islanders organizing to annex themselves to another nation. The prefect believed “these circumstances … easily explain the desire they have to belong to that nation and only by force do they accept the title of Colombian.”\(^9\) Other officials had alarmed the government before about islanders’ lack of national pride and identification. Cartographer Francisco Javier Vergara y Velasco documented similar attitudes two years earlier in his publication on the archipelago. “For nothing more than ambition do islanders call themselves British subjects or American citizens and not Colombians,”

\(^7\) The prefecture included a circuit judge and his secretary, two municipal judges, two public notaries, two schoolteachers, a fiscal agent, tax collectors, an alcalde, and a corregidor (Registro de Bolívar, October 10, 1887).


\(^9\) Juan Ramírez, “Informe del Prefecto de la Provincia de San Andrés,” May 8, 1890, Informe del Gobernador de Bolívar a la Asamblea Departamental en sus sesiones ordinarias de 1890 (Bogotá), p. 43.
he wrote, “since they believe these countries could offer them a more efficient government and better protection” (Vergara y Velasco 1888:27).

Despite initiatives designed to combat cultural divisions such as opening a primary school, Ramírez urged his superiors to transfer the islands to the Department of Panama. He argued that Panamanians were more familiar with commercial transactions involving the United States and other countries in the Greater Caribbean. The Panamanians, he noted, even used the same money, most likely the United States currency that circulated both in Panama and San Andrés at the same time. Further, he observed, “The special laws that govern that department are more in line with the needs of this region” (Ramírez 1890:44). The Department of Bolívar, moreover, had difficulties maintaining regular contact with the islands via postal service. The province did not have sufficient funds to pay for a jail and therefore “leased a small wooden house only ten feet long by five feet wide” to serve as a lockup for criminals (Ramírez 1890:44). Given all of these factors, the prefect questioned the department’s ability to govern the islands. Ultimately, departmental officials did not pursue Ramírez’s proposal, and the archipelago remained a province of the Department of Bolívar until 1913.

**LINKAGES TO THE GREATER CARIBBEAN**

By 1900, San Andrés and Providence had closer economic ties to the Greater Caribbean than to mainland Colombia. Both islands served as way stations in a migratory circuit that linked the ports of Kingston (Jamaica), Bluefields (Nicaragua), Colón (Panama), and Bocas del Toro (Colombia) (Parsons 1956:38-39). First, West Indian merchant ships arrived to trade manufactured goods such as furniture, clothes, shoes, and canned food for the islanders’ fruit and even turtle meat and shell. At this time, traders came to the islands en route to more bustling commercial centers at Bluefields or Colón on the Caribbean coasts of Central America, attracted by Indian goods such as sarsaparilla (Bard 1855:39, Dunham 1850:39-51, 116-18). Second, islanders were involved in a more informal trade network of itinerant fishermen who traveled to the Caribbean rimlands in search of hawksbill and green sea turtles, which offered a modest but important source of income for several island families (Lefever 1992:53-55, Reid 1987:127-30). In these two overlapping trading circuits, San Andrés and Providence islanders became better integrated into the Greater Caribbean, which reinforced commercial and familial bonds from earlier decades.

10. A Panamanian reporter begged for improved transport in the port of Colón, too. He noted a trip to San Andrés took between sixteen and eighteen days due to poor weather and slow sail winds. See *The Colon Telegram* (Panama), March 12, 1893.
A strong seafaring tradition had existed on the islands for centuries. The Miskitu Indians of Nicaragua on the Mosquito Shore were the first fishermen to travel to the archipelago and its adjacent cays in search of turtle eggs. By the eighteenth century, European accounts spoke of roving settlers; later, there were records of English-speaking subjects of the Spanish Crown on San Andrés who followed the migratory journey of turtles to the southern Caribbean seas of Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama (Dampier 2007:96-99). Nineteenth-century travel accounts describe Providence island men leaving behind their wives and children to travel in pairs in search of “green flesh” in the nearby cays of Serranilla, Quitasueño, and Roncador. In the months of March to June, these men waited patiently for hawksbill turtles to lay their eggs before capturing, killing, and drying them for meat (Bard 1855:39). Green turtles were especially prized for their delicious flesh, whereas the hawksbill was valued for its sturdy shell. While Jamaican and Cayman Islanders dominated the turtle trade in the circum-Caribbean, shell was traded region-wide. For example, turtle fishermen received twenty colones, the equivalent of five dollars in the United States, for each shell in Costa Rica in the mid-nineteenth century (Palmer 2005:35).

The islanders were also involved in a robust fruit trade primarily involving coconuts and oranges, which brought them regularly into contact with Jamaican and American traders who traveled up and down the Caribbean rims of Central America (Vergara y Velasco 1888:57). The coconut trade between British West Indians and the Atlantic lowland communities in Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama began in the early nineteenth century. In 1817, U.S. trader Captain Jacob Dunham recounted in his travel memoir how he had purchased several thousand coconuts for export from the Kuna on San Blas Islands, a province of Panama. Indigenous and Creole traders on the offshore island of Bocas del Toro near northern Panama also carried on a thriving coconut trade, which peaked in the 1840s. New Granada (Colombia) migrants threatened this trade when, in their eagerness to earn high profits, they started to cut down trees in order to obtain the hard-to-reach nuts. In 1841, it was reported that four or five ships came to San Andrés each year in search of coconuts (Dunham 1850:39, Vergara y Velasco 1888:38). Yet the coconut trade did not increase until after the emancipation of the slaves on San Andrés in the 1850s. Thereafter, newly emancipated slaves and their descendants took a prominent role in this economic activity (Stillman 1877:272).

The trade in both coconuts and turtle necessitated transportation between ports in the Greater Antilles and the Caribbean littoral of Central America. The Daily Gleaner, the leading Jamaican newspaper, regularly advertised the arrival of ships carrying cargo and passengers to and from San Andrés and Providence. For example, the Atlas Steamship Company traversed among the ports of Kingston, Puerto Limón, Greytown, Bluefields, Rio Grande, Cape Gracias, and the islands of San Andrés and Providence throughout the
1880s. The cargo of these vessels included ponies from Old Providence brought for sale to Jamaica. A decade later, sloops and schooners like the Elva and Enterprise announced their departures to the islands. But these journeys were often dangerous, and news accounts often reported lost schooners, wreckages, and hurricanes. Table 1 lists the distances in miles as well as the number of hours between the Colombian archipelago of San Andrés and Providence and various ports in the eastern and western Caribbean via sailboat in the early decades of the twentieth century. These voyages served to connect the Greater Antilles and the far-flung Caribbean communities nestled at the edges of Spanish America.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ports</th>
<th>Distance in Miles</th>
<th>Trip in Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corn Islands (Nicaragua)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Limón (Costa Rica)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocas del Toro (Panama)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colón (Panama)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Cayman Island (U.K.)</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartagena (Colombia)</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston (Jamaica)</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While transport between Jamaica and the Colombian islands never was as frequent as transport between San Andrés island and the nearby Corn Islands or Panama, it dropped off in the early years of the twentieth century. In contrast to the period between 1883 and 1890, shipping advertisements listed in editions of the Daily Gleaner are scant after 1900. Port records for the Colombian archipelago from August to October 1902 indicate that the bulk of the ships entering and departing from the islands were destined for Colón,

Turtle Bogue, and the Corn Islands. Only one ship from the Cayman Islands passed through the port at San Andrés.\textsuperscript{15} Residents of the Talamanca coast in Costa Rica recalled receiving the bulk of their fruits from San Andrés Island at the turn of the twentieth century (Palmer 2005:48). The decline in travel between Jamaica and the Colombian archipelago suggests that the export boom and railroad projects in Central America had brought West Indians from the eastern Caribbean into greater contact with the islands.

Newspapers offer a glimpse into these connections, as news about San Andrés Island occasionally emerged in print. Obituaries appeared in memory of beloved family members who had died on San Andrés, like Dr. Thomas Daniel Wilberforce Hemans who spent a quarter of a century living on the island as a physician and serving in various government offices. Even the less prominent like Vida Hall who had resided on the island for twenty-seven years had not yet been forgotten by friends and family in Jamaica.\textsuperscript{16} News accounts also reported visits from prominent islanders such as Baptist pastor Thomas Livingston, who gave a sermon at a local Jamaican church.\textsuperscript{17} Other accounts reported islanders as assailants with or victims of Jamaicans in criminal cases in Panama.\textsuperscript{18} These examples of news reporting reflect not only the connections islanders had with Jamaicans but the archipelago’s place within the Greater Caribbean and in many ways the press helped to unite disparate migrants into one single transnational community (Putnam 2009:107).

**MIGRATION**

The ongoing and regular contact with the people in the circum-Caribbean led to the arrival of mostly British West Indian migrants, who came as shopkeepers, sea captains, merchant-traders, and professionals. Unlike the shores of Panama and Cuba, which tens of thousands of West Indian laborers flooded to between 1890 and 1910, San Andrés and Providence received fewer than


\textsuperscript{17} “Fine Sermon,” *The Gleaner*, October 8, 1912, p. 4.

British West Indian Migration to San Andrés and Providence

a thousand people during the same period. Although historians tend to privilege scale in analyzing migratory patterns, the numbers do not often reveal migrants’ motivations and the relationships they had with their host society. Several British West Indian migrants held prominent positions in the San Andrés and Providence communities, which allows for insight into their lives.

British West Indian migrants used kinship ties, education, and professional skills to obtain employment or open businesses on the islands. In several cases, marital ties with established families solidified their positions. Alexander Abrahams, a Jamaican Jew, arrived in the 1870s and formed an important alliance through his marriage with Catherine Bernard, the daughter of a wealthy Afro-Caribbean landowner in San Andrés. His literacy and fluency in Spanish and English enabled him to serve as a local administrator, and later, he accumulated wealth from his wife’s property (Laverde 1991:173-75). Similar marriages occurred elsewhere in the circum-Caribbean. One historian suggests that unions between British West Indian migrants and the Anglophone resident Bay islanders helped to protect newcomers from anti-black legislation seeking to deport them from Honduras (Chambers 2010:87).

Beginning in the twentieth century, Baptist churches kept marriage registers, which contained numerous examples of unions between islanders and spouses originally hailing from the Cayman Islands, Bocas del Toro, Trinidad, and Jamaica. Due to the mobile nature of Caribbean life, the Baptist minister on San Andrés required islanders seeking to marry West Indians to provide witnesses testifying to their knowledge of the attendant’s single status. On June 27, 1895, Edward Reese of Bocas del Toro and Arteucia Bowie of San Andrés asked Pastor Brockholst Livingston to marry them but he declined to do so until the couple furnished proof of Reese’s divorce to Enix Britton, his first wife. The fiancés provided two witnesses, Mrs. Agnes McNish and Marselina Hooker “who are (both members of our church and former residents of Bocas del Toro) and Mrs. Olimpha Downs also native resident of Bocas del Toro who had come over to pay a visit to this island.” Livingston met each witness individually and separately questioned them, having them sign a written declaration.20 Bigamy appeared to be a great con-

19. He died at 70 years of age on August 23, 1912. See “Obituary,” The Searchlight (San Andrés), September 2, 1912, p. 4.
cern as migrants, in particular, frequently followed employment opportunities often leaving behind their families.

A number of British West Indian migrants became prominent members of the San Andrés and Providence communities, offering innumerable professional services. Jamaican migrants Jeremiah Lynton and Jeremiah Mitchell became well-known shopkeepers, whereas Thomas Hemans of Jamaica and Phillip Francis of Trinidad served as prominent physicians on San Andrés. Lynton, for example, was a shoemaker and once-proprietor of a saloon. He later owned a commercial house called San Andrés Stock Company. Arriving around 1900, the Jamaican shopkeeper spent nearly fifty years on the island until his death in 1949. A photo of his gravesite is shown in Figure 1. Hemans and Francis were two of three physicians residing on the island. The islands also enjoyed the professional services of pharmacists and schoolteachers who originally came from places such as Jamaica and even the Bahamas. Others, like Seventh-Day Adventist congregant Agnes Jane Schmidt Duffis, originally came from the island of St. Eustatius in the Dutch Antilles. Duffis spent over thirty years on San Andrés (Duffis 2000:57).

It is not entirely clear how most migrants learned of the tiny Caribbean island, but Phillip Francis and a few others might offer a clue. In 1903, Francis completed his medical studies at Meharry Medical School in Nashville, Tennessee, and met a few San Andrés islanders while passing through the port of Colón in Panama on route to Trinidad. They insisted he set up a practice there, as the islanders were in desperate need of a physician (Benlloch 1976:115-16). In 1916, Alfred J.C. Browne, a native of Black River, Jamaica,
relocated to San Andrés from Panama to serve as a pharmacist, or druggist, at the beckoning of the physicians on the island.24 Whereas Josiah Cranston of Jamaica came at the invitation of Baptist minister Brockholst Livingston to give instruction at their religious school (Petersen 2001:96), Noel Gonçalves of British Guiana accepted the position to serve as pastor at the First Baptist Church in San Andrés (Turnage 1975:53). As these accounts indicate, entrepreneurial opportunities existed for West Indian professionals willing to set up practices and businesses on these Colombian islands.

Although several British West Indian migrants became notable residents, relations with the locals were occasionally tense. Violent clashes occurred between Jamaicans and islanders. For example, Jeremiah H. Lynton reported to the British Colonial Office that he had been shot in a drunken fight between Police Inspector Bent and Adrian Taylor, who died at Lynton’s saloon on San Andrés. A judge sentenced Bent to six months in prison, but Bent “regained his liberty immediately after the trial ended.”

On another occasion, Providence Island merchant and sea captain Cleveland Hawkins accused a British subject, most likely a Jamaican resident, of burning down his store in Providence. Several islanders believed the suspect had exacted revenge on Hawkins because he supported the removal of the intendant from office.

While these tense interactions had discrete causes, evidence also suggests that national affiliations and interests at times may have superseded kinship ties and shared Anglophone Caribbean culture. For example, islanders disliked rogue British West Indian fishermen who failed to obtain proper licenses before competing with them for turtle on Roncador and Serranilla cays – territory that belonged to Colombia. In 1914, Simon A. Howard stated fishing rights were one of the many challenges facing the archipelago. British Caribbean “fleets of vessels all year round, in season and out of season, carrying on fishing for the valuable tortoise shell and sponges; extract Guano and gather Bird eggs, without license of payment of any contribution, whatever, detrimental to our territorial sovereignty.” Fishing rights arose as a significant issue a decade later when Colombian authorities captured and imprisoned thirty-one British West Indians, eighteen from Cayman Brac on the grounds of illegal turtle fishing. This escape eventually resulted in their release but the Jamaican press regularly informed its readership on this diplomatic manner. Others, like Francis A. Newball, the editor and founder of the first island newspaper, *The Searchlight*, chastised West Indian residents...


for bringing their folk traditions, such as obeah, to impoverished islanders seeking not to repay their debts. Similar concerns about recent British West Indian arrivals arose in the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua, where Moravian missionaries complained of the reintroduction of obeahism into the community, which hindered their work (Gordon 1998:67). In both instances, national loyalties and local interests trumped shared language, culture, and even family ties to the British West Indies.

San Andrés and Providence islanders found themselves in the Greater Antilles, too. It was common for well-to-do islanders to send their children to attend secondary schools abroad. Until the first quarter of the twentieth century, the Colombian government had poorly run public schools, and affluent islanders who valued formal education sent their children to attend secondary school in Jamaica or, if possible, the United States. Pastor Thomas Livingston attended Titchfield High School in Port Antonio, one of the oldest schools in Jamaica, before attending Howard University in Washington DC. Colombian Javier Vergara suggested the push had more to do with parents’ desire to instill in their children an Anglo cultural experience (Vergara y Velasco 1888:27). Some islanders even sought better opportunities in Jamaica, as was the case of stowaway Alfred Rosendo Bowden, a chauffeur from San Andrés, who “took free passage” on the Pastores to Kingston after hearing “that ’chauffeuring’ was flourishing in Jamaica” and after a judge had revoked his driver’s license in Panama. Bowden and his fellow stowaway Samuel Brown never made it to San Andrés; they were immediately returned to Panama on the steamer Colombia.

A TRANSTIONAL WORLD FrRACTURED

In the first decades of the twentieth century, local and supranational factors fractured the long-held linkages between the Colombian archipelago and

30. Jeremiah H. Lynton sent his two daughters Ina and Violet to attend school in Kingston. Ina fell ill and, soon thereafter, died while away at school. See Oswald L. Robinson, “Obituary,” The Searchlight, November 1, 1912, p. 2. This was common in other Caribbean borderland communities; see Reid & Gutiérrez 1986:56.
the Greater Antilles. Commerce and migrants flowed to mainland Colombia and Panama. In 1913, central authorities in Bogota removed San Andrés and Providence from the Department of Bolívar, which had governed the islands for nearly a quarter of a century. The territory was to be administered directly under the auspices of the ministry of government as an intendancy. While departmental officials in Cartagena met this transfer with resistance, they ultimately failed to circumvent the removal, which had gained popular support from a number of island inhabitants. Other peripheral areas such as the Chocó and the Llanos also became intendancies, which allowed presidents to appoint officials to govern them as national territories and manage their day-to-day administration. This administrative change signaled a commitment from Bogota officials to correct a century of neglect with a more responsive government.

Central authorities in Bogota disliked the cultural and commercial connections between the archipelago and the Anglophone world. These links reflected their inability to assert control over the territory and, moreover, incorporate the ethnically distinct population into the larger Colombian nation. In 1912, federal census taker Santiago Guerrero urged the Minister of Government to take action in bridging the cultural gap between the islanders and mainland Colombians. “There is much to do on these islands, principally teaching the inhabitants that they are Colombians as many do not know it. The language, religion, customs – everything is absolutely contrary to ours.” Naval officer Emilio Eitón reached the same conclusion during his brief stint on the island a year later. While noting many “patriotic” island men interested in closing the gap between the archipelago and the mainland, it was clear that islanders did not have an intimate understanding of Colombia. “There is veneration here for Colombia but not because Colombians have fulfilled our brotherly duty,” he wrote. Eitón criticized poor government for failing to instruct islanders in Colombian history, Roman Catholicism, and the Spanish language – characteristics that he believed defined a Colombian national. Unlike Guerrero, Eitón downplayed the island connections to the United States and the British Caribbean. He viewed islanders’ “fondness” for these nations as “natural” given that a shared language placed the archipelago into “greater contact and greater intimacy with those nations” (Eitón 1913:60, 78).

34. For examples of departmental resistance, see Carlos A. Capela, “Islas de San Andrés de Providencia,” El Caribe: Periodico político y de variedades, Cartagena, July 11, 1912; and Gabriel Bustos Villareal, “San Andrés y Providencia,” La Época, Cartagena, July 8, 1912. For islander support of intendancy, see petition of Thomas B. Livingston and 150 signers to President Carlos E. Restrepo, January 4, 1912, Ministerio de Gobierno, Sección Primera, Tomo 698, Folios 408-10, AGN, Bogotá; and F. Newball, “National Territory,” The Searchlight, June 1, 1911, p. 1.

Other state reports insisted upon the dangers of American businessmen and West Indian migrants inhibiting close relations between the islands and mainland Colombia. While local officials perceived concerns about the United States as urgent, considering the recent conflict over Panamanian secession and the canal, they equally viewed Afro-Caribbean immigrants as hampering efforts to close the gap between the archipelago and mainland Colombia. They sought to replace “Jamaican” public school teachers with bilingual mainland or even island Colombians. The intendancy offered scholarships to island students interested in pursuing teaching degrees in Bogotá, Cartagena, or Medellín, thus competing for children whose parents considered sending them to study in Jamaica or the United States. Moreover, state officials tried to bridge communications between the archipelago and mainland. Islanders obtained government jobs as postal service carriers for transporting mail and official correspondence between the islands and mainland Colombia brought more islanders into contact with these ports, people, and opportunities.

Colombian efforts to assert control over territorial domains coincided with supranational shifts in West Indian migration in the region. By 1930, a worldwide depression and the fall in commodity prices reduced the need for West Indian laborers. Several Spanish American nations enforced legislation restricting further migration of black workers, such as Panama in 1926, Honduras in 1929, and Guatemala and Nicaragua in 1936 (Putnam 2009:116-17). Caribbean fishermen accustomed to transporting goods and people to communities in the borderlands increasingly confronted fines and even arrest for unlawful entry into ports. Even in San Andrés port officials dutifully enforced entry requirements, asking West Indian travelers for passports and visa stamps, which were costly for many seeking to return home.

38. Gonzalo Pérez, November 1913, Ministerio de Gobierno, Sección Primera, Tomo 713, Folio 87, AGN, Bogotá.
39. A collection of oral accounts of seafaring on San Andrés and Providence led to 44 interviews, all mentioning travel to Cartagena in the post-1940s (see Robinson Abrahams 2004).
home or to find new employment opportunities. And migrants still had difficulties even with appropriate documentation and cash. One historian argues that economic factors alone, however, do not explain the virulent anti-black legislation that emerged in the Western Hemisphere, since previous crises in the 1890s through World War I did not lead to such action. An international shift in attitudes toward race, citizenship, and geographic boundaries better explains this legislation. As the United States enforced immigration restrictions on Central and South Americans, as well as West Indians, Latin American nations sought ways to distinguish themselves from their blacker counterparts in the region through a vigorous campaign against Afro-Caribbean immigrant labor (Putnam 2010:290-303). This meant that West Indian migration to the circum-Caribbean became more difficult and costly for those without passports and visas, while those remaining in Spanish American republics faced uncertain futures. Debates emerged on issues of citizenship for immigrants and their descendants.

CONCLUSION

San Andrés and Providence islanders have not forgotten their links to the Greater Caribbean. In 2003, eighty-one-year-old San Andrés islander Walwin Petersen fulfilled a long-held dream by traveling to the home of his paternal family. “My great grandfather is from Black River and his name was William James Bent. So I’m related, I believe, to all the Bents in Jamaica and this is one of the biggest families we have on San Andrés,” he shared with a Jamaican reporter from The Gleaner. Petersen further explained that he had also traced his roots to Curaçao, the United States, and Europe but found his closest connections to the British Caribbean. He lamented that diplomatic ties had not led to easier travel and better communication between Colombia and Jamaica. “Culturally we are linked with Jamaica but one of the things that I cry shame about, is that our governments have not done nothing to keep this historic and cultural tie between us.” Petersen is not alone. Other islanders recall these linkages, some even placing them as central to island heritage.

In this essay, I situated San Andrés and Providence islands as part of the Greater Caribbean, stretching from northern Honduras to southern Panama crossing to the Antilles and beyond. In so doing, I have outlined three key ideas about the Caribbean as a region, captured not from the perspective

of state officials and foreign company owners, but through the purview of the highly mobile Caribbean population. First, mobility of persons, goods, and information in the late-nineteenth to early-twentieth century served to create a transnational region where ports and nearby communities were linked to the larger region. San Andrés Island was more closely connected to Kingston; Bocas del Toro, Panama; and Puerto Cabezas, Nicaragua, than to Bogotá or even Cartagena, in spite of its political affiliation. Migrants crossed, disregarded, and overlooked politicized boundaries. Second, jobs in the oil fields of Venezuela, banana plantations of Costa Rica, sugar plantations of Cuba, and the canal project of Panama, which attracted thousands of West Indian migrants to Spanish America, were not the only available economic opportunities. Professionals including teachers, pastors, physicians, and itinerant fishermen also relocated to the Caribbean basin to help maintain a link between the core and peripheral edges of the region. Third, and finally, the region was highly fragile and vulnerable to the interests of national elites. Territorial disputes, shifts in global economies and national politics restricted mobility, which fractured these linkages.
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In *Envisioning Caribbean Futures: Jamaican Perspectives* (2007), Brian Meeks writes “in sympathy with the new social movements that have evolved in the past decade which assert boldly that ‘another world is possible’” (p. 2). His effort is “to explore the horizons for different approaches to social living in Jamaica and the Caribbean in the twenty-first century” (p. 2). In this, he “seeks to move beyond a statement of general principles to propose specific alternatives” in order to “stimulate a conversation that looks beyond the horizon of policy confines, yet is not so far removed as to appear hopelessly utopian” (p. 3). My hope with this essay is to advance that conversation, in the first place by reviewing and assessing Meeks’s contribution and then by extending the discussion to the role that Jamaica’s diaspora (and by extension that of the region’s generally) might play in moving the country, as Meeks puts it, from its current “state of crime and murder, and the broad undermining of the rule of law that pervades the society” (p. 71).

Central to Meeks’s thinking are Antonio Gramsci’s insights into the mechanisms by which ruling classes generate and retain legitimacy. Though a Marxist, Gramsci argued that class domination is not simply an economic phenomenon. Rather a ruling class is most successful when prevailing attitudes result in most people’s accepting their subordinate status as reasonable and normal. A functional system of class rule requires a political culture in which elite dominance is thought of as commonsensical. Gwynn Williams summarized Gramsci’s concept in the following terms: Hegemony is “an order in which a certain way of life and thought is dominant, in which one concept of reality is diffused throughout the society in all its institutional and private manifestations, informing with its spirit all taste, morality, customs, religious and political principles, and all social relations, particularly in their intellectual and moral connotations” (quoted in Genovese 1971:406).

In an article published in 2000, Meeks argued that Jamaica was in crisis because such an ideological consensus was absent in the country. He wrote that on one hand “the social bloc in charge of Jamaican society is no longer
ruling over a people convinced of its social superiority and its inherent right to, using the popular Jamaican phrase, ‘run things.’” But on the other hand though “the old hegemonic alliance is unable to rule in the accustomed way … alternative and competitive modes of hegemony from below are unable to decisively place their stamp on the new and fluid situation” (Meeks 2000:61, 64). Writing a decade later, he believes that the process of dissolution has intensified. Emigration now plays an important role in the continued decline. According to Meeks, the loss of skilled and educated Jamaicans to overseas markets “lies at the heart of advanced hegemonic dissolution.” He writes, “the middle classes … have not only withdrawn from their leadership role in shaping the contours of the ‘respectable’ Jamaican social order but have departed in massive numbers from the country itself” (p. 73).

Citing the work of Paget Henry, Obika Gray, and Deborah Thomas, Meeks today sees a “widening fissure, originating from below, from the ways and means of official Jamaican society.” Manifestations of this widening gap in attitudes between the Jamaican upper class and the rest of the country are to be found in the effort to raise the status of Jamaican patwa to that of an official language, in protests for justice and, as he writes, “most of all [in] the rising wave of ‘conscious’ lyrics that permeate the dancehall” (p. 77).

The problem for the country is that while the ideological hegemony of the wealthy classes in Jamaica has weakened, a counter-worldview – referred to by Meeks as a “subaltern insurgency” – is not well enough developed to undergird the construction of a new social order. The philosophy of the subalterns is “more imminent than apparent” and their alternative furthermore “has failed to forge commensurate institutional structures and processes to carry forward its agenda.” It is true, he writes, that “the popular social forces are on the cultural offensive but [they] have not developed an institutional programme.” The wealthy “are in social and cultural retreat,” but nonetheless maintain their grip politically, albeit a grip weakened by the fact their rule is not accorded the respect and deference it received in the past (p. 78).

With the breakdown of the rulers’ ideological authority and the weakness of the subaltern insurgency, Jamaica is in a period of “uncertainty and of aimless meandering.” It is experiencing “intense social frustration and the dangerously postponed birth of a popular alternative” (p. 78). The present moment is, as he puts it, “fraught” when “those who can afford it, turn to private security services to secure their homes and property. Those without property turn to the don. The gun – legal or illegal – becomes a common possession. Violence, when codes of conduct lose their salience, becomes the first resort in conflict resolution,” and that violence when repeated “raises its own threshold and constantly re-establishes new benchmarks as to what is permissible” (p. 78). In a legitimacy void and with the breakdown of accepted moral codes, “all segments of society look for ways to circumvent
the law.” This is the consequence of “the melting of social glue, of the erosion of even a paper-thin notion of common consent” (p. 116).

In a situation in which “none of the social classes is able to decisively take charge of the direction of the nation,” it is necessary, according to Meeks, to start afresh. What this requires, he thinks, is “to find pragmatic forms of collective mobilization and accompanying institutional arrangements” (p. 96). Such an approach necessitates a national strategy “based on a critical alliance between those social forces with an interest in the development of the island space of Jamaica, the region and its diaspora” (p. 97).

In seeking a basis upon which to construct a new social and political consensus, Meeks explicitly rules out an imposition from above. Could Jamaican society cohere using the authoritarianism that has been successfully employed in Singapore or China? His answer is a decisive no: “the historical memory of slavery, the more recent experience of multi-party elections and the relatively easy ability to migrate all militate against the authoritarian option.” Freedom, according to him, is a “powerful and irrepressible theme in Jamaica and Caribbean reality” (p. 117).

Meeks proposes three initiatives to build a foundation for a new social consensus. There would have to be a national process of reconciliation in order to exorcise the bitterness associated with the violence the country experienced during the late 1970s when Michael Manley was the prime minister. Second, an extensive land reform program is needed; a process that he believes would reduce poverty, slow the migration to the cities, and “provide the foundation for a new modality of popular democratic development” (p. 118). This would involve not merely the reallocation of a productive asset. As well it would deprive the landed class of a source of their privileged status in society. Both would advance the cause of greater equality in the nation. Third, he calls for the convening of an institution he names the Constituent Assembly of the Jamaican People at Home and Abroad. This would not be a legislative body – the House of Representatives would remain intact. Rather, as Meeks puts it, the Assembly would meet every ten years to “once again debate and discuss the terms of living and the agenda for the future.” As such it would “constantly reinvigorate the national debate, re legitimize a new responsive political order and bring new generations of active citizens into the centre of a broad and inclusive national discourse” (p. 130). Meeks’s suggested agenda items for the first Assembly would include deepening democracy, linking the economy to popular culture, the pursuit of a closer Caribbean union beyond the Caribbean Single Market and Economy, and a discussion of a new ethos for the nation (pp. 118-19).

Though Meeks presents reconciliation, land reform, and the convening of the Assembly as three equally important elements in a “foundation for a new beginning,” he nevertheless argues that “the work of the national reconciliation commission would precede everything else, and further progress in the build-
ing of national consensus would be contingent on its success” (p. 118). In this regard he refers to the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission as the model to be followed to create “a template for truth and honesty in political behavior in further stages of the new national consensus” (p. 118).

Meeks’s discussion is insightful on two levels. His is the single best assessment of the conundrums that face Jamaican society that I know of. Much of its value derives from his skillful use of Gramscian concepts and his demonstration of the power that this form of revisionist Marxism possesses. The concepts of hegemony, counter-hegemony, and in this case failed hegemony allow Meeks to identify the inability of both the traditional elite and would-be alternatives to move the country forward. It is that dual inability that lies at the root of the problems that confront present-day Jamaica.

Reservations arise not with Meeks’s analysis of why Jamaica has failed to move forward. Instead, questions emerge concerning the suggestions that he offers to overcome that immobility. Specifically, there is only a low probability that his proposals will be adopted. Furthermore even if they were instituted, they are unlikely to possess the reconstructive impact that Meeks suggests they would have. In each case his anticipations are likely to be disappointed.

With regard to the first issue, the Jamaican political context is not one in which it is likely that a truth and reconciliation effort will achieve significant results. As Rupert Lewis has noted, when that process was employed in South Africa it acted as a vehicle by which the incoming government of Nelson Mandela ensured that it would, in Lewis’s formulation, “not be sabotaged by elements in the military in particular and white extremists who wanted to create a separate white state.”1 In this it was successful. It allowed whites who had committed human rights violations to admit their violations and in turn be accorded amnesty. The Jamaican context however does not provide a comparable opportunity. To be sure, both major political parties in Jamaica should purge themselves of their ties to gangs and organized crime and thereby undertake a sea change in the political process. But as Lewis writes, both of the country’s major “parties have become compromised to such a large extent that they lack the capability for internal regulation or party cleansing.”2 With that the case, truth and reconciliation cannot play the role that Meeks hopes for it.

Meeks’s discussion of land reform raises similar doubts. There is no question that the ownership of land in Jamaica is grossly unequal. Providing land to landless farmers would result in greater equity and might, contingent upon the competence of the recipients, also result in enhanced output. But
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while this is true, an effort to achieve land redistribution is certain to generate formidable opposition by the country’s still powerful land-owning class. This raises the question of whether the proponents of redistribution can be expected to generate a sufficient level of political support to overcome what almost certainly will be fierce landowner hostility. Unfortunately, the nature and strength of the resistance and what would be required to beat it back is a set of problems that makes success unlikely.

This omission of an assessment of how such a reforming coalition could be constructed is particularly troublesome because only 17 percent of the country’s labor force works in its agricultural sector. In order to be successful, land reform advocates therefore will have to find political backing from urban Jamaicans. There are grounds to believe that such a rural/urban alliance is possible. As Meeks puts it, not only would the rural poor benefit from land reform, “but all city dwellers would gain from a prosperous countryside, as urban drift would be radically reduced” (p. 173). This may well be true. But the fact that such a potential outcome can be identified is not sufficient to make the case that people in the cities will join politically with rural reformers. There is a great deal of history that suggests such a coalition is quite difficult to construct, and the Jamaican experience is no exception in this regard. This is all the more the case since “given Jamaica’s history of partisanship and patronage, any extensive land reform might simply evolve into a corrupt exercise to give land to the cronies and supporters of the dominant party” (p. 125). In short, more than a statement of potential common interests is needed to be convincing that land reform can be put on Jamaica’s agenda. What is required is evidence that the process of coalition-building is underway and that the resulting bloc – no matter how embryonic – shows some signs of viability. This Meeks does not do.

The obstacles to implementing land reform constitute only one instance of the difficulties that will undoubtedly be encountered in the effort to reduce upper-class privilege in Jamaica and achieve an alternative hegemony. Though Meeks’s discussion of this issue is quite brief, he does offer grounds for optimism. He thinks there will be at least some upper-class Jamaicans who will stay in the country and forego their dispensations. They will do so because “for all social classes, an economy in which windows of possibility were opening rather than slamming shut would engender social peace.” He writes, “the Jamaican wealthy and middle classes, who increasingly live in gated communities and spend large fractions of the day ferrying their children in air-conditioned cars to and from school, would once again be able to walk in public spaces” (p. 173). In addition, Meeks is hopeful that the mass emigration of middle-class and well-educated Jamaicans that disrupted

Democratic Socialism in the 1970s will not be repeated. He cites the fact that even wealthy émigrés to the United States are likely to find in the North a “disconnection from community, absence of recognition and prominence of race,” and joins that with his view that in the United States “national chauvinism and racism are waxing.” Meeks’s anticipation is that the Jamaican upper class, in calculating “the profound psychic benefits of a reinstated social freedom ... against the inevitable loss of some hierarchical privileges” may refrain from a mass exodus (pp. 173-74).

Whatever might be said about the probability of the Jamaican upper class joining in the effort to achieve greater equality, there is an obvious difficulty with the claim that those remaining in the country will be reform supporters. It is only too easy to turn his argument around and arrive at a conclusion opposite from Meeks’s. On the grounds that Meeks cites – namely that the United States will not welcome wealthy Jamaicans as much in the future as it has in the past – those individuals, denied a safe harbor, would more likely join the opposition to reform at home than support a new hegemony. To be sure, the loss of human capital associated with the migration is socially damaging. But an elitist population that remains home with a strong incentive to resist egalitarian change would be likely to substantially strengthen the forces opposed to reform.

Third and finally, Meeks does not grapple sufficiently with the question of whether a broadly representative segment of the Jamaican population will find his suggestions for a Constituent Assembly attractive. For such an institution to be effective, Meeks believes that there will have to be “a global conversation on the future of Jamaica and Jamaicans, which can only take place through a series of encounters by representatives and as many people as possible within the island and the diaspora” (p. 118). But it is not at all certain that the subaltern worldview that is present in the country today is consistent with the kind of deliberative body that Meeks has in mind. David Scott’s assessment of Zeeks, one of the inner-city dons who dominate urban life, points to doubts in that regard. Scott writes that in dealing with such dons it will be necessary “to give up the idea that consensus can be underwritten by a universalist and rationalist moral-politics of improvement.” Damagingly for this dimension of Meeks’s project, Scott reports that it is not likely that “the indigestible and inassimilable identities Zeeks and his supporters embody are to be re-educated for middle class civility” (Scott 2000:298). The difficulty here is that it is just that kind civility that will be required if an Assembly is to serve its deliberative function. Indeed Meeks seems to acknowledge the incompatibility between the deliberation that he advocates and the authoritarian nature of garrison community culture. Though he believes that an accommodation is possible between the state with its systems of debate and the don’s unilateral power, he acknowledges that such an agreement could be implemented only “while ruling certain forms of behavior [on the part of
the dons] entirely out of court.” For Meeks’s vision to be implemented, the leaders of the garrison communities will have to change in ways that Scott warns are unlikely.

Near the end of his study, Meeks asks “can such a project of social and political renewal gain traction and support in the world of Jamaican real-politik?” (p. 174). His answer is a tentative affirmative. His hope is that the impetus for building an egalitarian democracy will come from “among the community residents who demonstrate for justice and fairness, the new middle-class recruits who join the political parties to initiate constitutional change and the organized working class, who have never been happy with globalization’s race to the bottom” (p. 175). Perhaps. But the dynamic of contemporary Jamaican society suggests that such an outcome is a long shot at best. Notwithstanding its weaknesses, the Jamaican elite’s dominance will not be downsized without a struggle. At the same time, those who might someday be in position to dismantle the country’s structure of wealth and power posses a worldview that is more likely to result in a populist authoritarianism than in the deliberative democracy that is Meeks’s goal. The sad fact is that neither of the two contending forces present in Jamaica today is likely to undertake the kind of social reconstruction that the country so badly needs. The wealthy elite is in decline, eroded from within by migration, while its nationalist mandate has been tarnished by slow economic growth, a growing drugs culture, and criminal violence. At the same time, however the subordinate classes do not possess a cultural apparatus that would allow them to lead a country that can succeed in the information age.

Though there is little reason to believe that positive change will find a domestic source, a basis for hope lies in Jamaica’s expatriate community. The possibility that Jamaican émigrés could become transformative agents of change exists because of the size and composition of the outflow of people that has occurred in recent years. The United States Bureau of the Census reported that in 2006 there were 622,748 people living in the United States who were born in Jamaica. With Jamaica’s population estimated at about 2,700,000, this means that almost one-fourth of the people who reasonably can be called Jamaican were resident in the United States. But what is even more remarkable than the size of this migration is its composition. Frédéric Docquier and Abdelsam Marfouk (2005:Tables A.1-1, A.1-2) estimate that 85.1 percent of Jamaicans with a college education were resident outside of the country between 1990 and 2000. Even by Caribbean standards this is a remarkably high rate of loss of human capital.

There are of course compensating resource flows resulting from this migration. Meeks himself writes of “their remittances, investments, barrels of goods and regular visits home.” And he adds that overseas Jamaicans “continue to play a key role in national life through the financial support of thousands of young people who are able to go to school and university because of the funds provided by overseas-based relatives” (p. 142). But when Prachi Mishra (2006) estimated the losses associated with the emigration and compared them to the gains that resulted from resource flows back to the country, her results were unambiguously negative. Between 1980 and 2002 she calculated that while remittances as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product came to 7.4 percent, the country’s losses came to 20.4 percent. Migration, Mishra (2006:17) estimates, cost Jamaica 13.0 percent of its GDP over this period.

And Meeks is concerned that these costs might actually increase in the future. He writes that “unless there is an attempt to forge a more structured, organic link between those at home and those abroad, the full potential of this relationship will be squandered in the short-run and the salience of the diaspora may dissipate with time” (p. 142). However, Meeks makes very little attempt to identify that full potential. His discussion is confined to the suggestion that “an organized diaspora might more actively lobby on behalf of its home constituency in the Caribbean” in exchange for which the Jamaican government “might more actively defend the overseas interests of its migrants,” thereby gaining their greater loyalty (p. 143).

One possibility that Meeks does not take up is that overseas-based Jamaican managers and entrepreneurs might become active participants in the domestic Jamaican economy. Jamaica’s economic growth between 1990 and 2008 was unsatisfactorily slow, averaging 1.7 percent annually, only about half the rate of growth of the other “upper-middle income” countries. Since Jamaica’s doldrums, at least in part, can be traced to its relative economic stagnation, one strategy that should be considered to accelerate the country’s economic growth is to gain access to and employ the human capital resident in the diaspora. According to estimates prepared by the United States Census Bureau, 21.3 percent of native Jamaicans resident in the United States have earned a Bachelor’s Degree or higher with 27.7 percent classified as working in management, professional, and related occupations. What is at issue here is whether Jamaica can gain access to the entrepreneurship present among émigrés and thereby substantially accelerate its process of economic modernization.

There is a growing scholarly literature concerning the promotion of economic growth in this way. Thus Andres Solimano (2008) writes that in contrast to the past when there was widespread concern about a brain drain only

somewhat offset by remittances, today “we think more in terms of brain circulation, a two-way (or multiple directional) movement of talented individuals ... What is now highlighted is the way that there can be a ‘beneficial brain drain’” (Solimano 2008:2). Similarly, AnnaLee Saxenian (2006) reports that enhanced opportunities have emerged for countries once considered to be on the periphery to be the sources of technological innovation. In this she writes, “the key actors … are neither policymakers nor multinational corporations acting in isolation, although both certainly play a role, but rather communities of technically skilled immigrants with work experience and connections to Silicon Valley and related American technology centers” (Saxenian 2006:4). These are the “new Argonauts.” They are people who, once part of the brain drain, became successful in a country like the United States and then transplanted their expertise to their home country (Saxenian 2006:14).

Countries that have been most successful in reversing the outflow of human capital are China, India, South Korea, and Israel. Success in this project requires, among other things, that a nation invest heavily in tertiary education, something which as Saxenian notes most poor countries have not done. She reports further that countries that focus their development efforts on either attracting foreign direct investment as opposed to building up domestic human capital, or those that lack political stability are unlikely to attract high-level returnees. But when emigrants find that the institutional structure in their country of origin provides adequate incentives for them to fill an entrepreneurial role and that there is an adequate educational and institutional base to support such efforts, then the return of well-educated migrants becomes a realistic possibility (Saxenian 2006:6-7).

This has not occurred in Jamaica or the Caribbean. A substantial return flow of technologically sophisticated entrepreneurs has not materialized and the region has not become a hub from which new products or new production processes have emerged. Yet given the human capital that is present abroad, it is not difficult to imagine that the region could be the beneficiary of the return of its own Argonauts. In such a process the University of the West Indies could both provide the location where technologically sophisticated entrepreneurs could set up as researchers and act as an incubator for global market-penetrating start up firms. To date, however, though the Jamaican government has reached out to its overseas citizens, it has not focused on an Argonaut strategy. Its vision for the role of the diaspora has been confined to attracting funds rather than entrepreneurial talent.

Over the long term, the presence of Caribbean Argonauts would mean that the dynamic of the Jamaican economy could be greatly enhanced. Business initiatives could move the country closer to the global technological frontier than it is at present. Their potential profitability would be enhanced because the large Caribbean population in the United States could provide a favorable market environment. Jamaican-based businesses could test-market to poten-
tial consumers whose tastes and preferences they know well. On this basis, it is not unreasonable to project that Jamaica could become an exporting hub for the region as a whole.

But what would be just as important as the Argonauts’ economic impact would be their providing an impetus for a breakdown of the logjam that has stymied the country. If the New Argonauts were successful, their very success would be the foundation from which a new ideological hegemony could emerge. Their presence and voice would make the inadequacy of the traditional elite clear, while the paternalism of the garrison culture would be revealed as deeply dysfunctional in a changing world.

It is not possible to specify in any detail the content of a new worldview that would emerge in such a setting. Issues such as the extent to which the new entrepreneurs should – or should be allowed to – ensconce themselves as powers in the electoral system as well as economic and cultural leaders will become a contentious issue. It is one thing to say that a new constituency can be expected to vie for influence. It is entirely another issue to allow returning migrants to use their wealth to try to seize disproportionate electoral influence. The kinds of democratic reforms that Meeks advocates – in particular the control of money in political campaigns – would have to be adopted to constrain the reach of the new entrepreneurs (pp. 139-40).

Left unanswered in this discussion is who will promote the policy initiatives that can tap into and unleash the potential residing in the diaspora. Such initiatives can be expected to be forthcoming from neither the urban dispossessed and their leaders nor the retreating elite. It is true, as Meeks reports, that the economic recession has pressured the government to move in directions different from the neo-liberalism of the International Monetary Fund (p. 94). But to date this rethinking has not resulted in a strategic reformulation. The group upon whom the burden rests to persuade the country of the necessity of encouraging diaspora-initiated growth is the country’s intellectuals, particularly those at the university. They are best positioned to envision such a future and, both as citizens and members of the university community, are best located to work to delineate and achieve the policy innovations that are required. But for them to do so they must shed the long-held view that in the global system of capitalism countries like Jamaica are assigned permanently to dependency. Meeks comes close to breaking with that tradition when he comments that scholars such as Immanuel Wallerstein and Robert Brenner have not seriously enough considered the international impact of China’s economic growth (p. 88). This statement however is at a high level of generalization, and it is not clear how thoroughly he thinks that world systems theory has to be laid aside in order for Jamaica to shape its own niche in that international economy.

The diaspora strategy represents a policy departure that could be deployed to thrust Jamaica into economic modernity. However, the mobilizing of New
Argonauts will not occur unless there are opinion leaders who identify doing so as a way to break Jamaica’s ideological logjam. It is true that if such an approach were adopted, the country’s politics and culture would change. Such a path of change is risky. The new strategy might not work. And even if it did, it could well have negative unintended consequences. But the risks associated with the status quo for Jamaica and the region are much greater than those that come with innovation and change.
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I am thankful to Jay Mandle for his careful and very generous response to my book. It is perhaps an indicator of the depth of hegemonic dissolution in Jamaica and its attendant atmosphere of multiple distractions that more than three years after its publication there has been no major national or even university-wide discussion surrounding its content and extensive list of proposals.

That aside and to avoid unnecessary repetition of points with which we both agree, I think that Mandle is absolutely right in his main argument that there is a lacuna in the book on the potential economic role of the diaspora. *Envisioning* certainly makes an energetic case for the importance of overseas Jamaicans at the political levels and in the formulating of new terms of engagement through the “Constituent Assembly of Jamaican People at Home and Abroad.” However, the critical notion of Jamaicans and other Caribbean nationals actually investing and returning to play central entrepreneurial, technical, and administrative roles in the reconstruction of Jamaica, while hinted at, is insufficiently elaborated. In a context as he correctly asserts, where 27 percent of overseas Jamaican nationals are employed in professional or managerial capacities and where some 85 percent of all Jamaicans with tertiary education live overseas and particularly where there are vivid examples in India, China, and elsewhere of their diasporas playing crucial economic roles in national development, it is important that we should consider and reflect on Mandle’s “Argonaut” strategy.

My problem therefore is not at all with the strategy itself but rather the steps required in establishing the foundation for its implementation. Mandle, in developing his diaspora-led strategy eliminates both the truth commission and land reform on the basis that the alliance of social forces necessary to bring these two into being is neither manifest nor likely to develop in the short run. Therefore, he proposes that we need to shift from a political strategy of attempting to accumulate forces to a frontally economic one of encouraging the investment of diaspora capital and the return of skilled and
capable citizens. This approach, he argues, is to be advocated and encouraged by university academics who, presumably, have the voice and influence to shift policy decisively in this new direction.

There seem to be two very serious problems with this approach. The first is that I think he vastly overestimates the influence of the university with its disparate and often contradictory voices. University academics have been severely battered by the economic and ideological winds of neoliberalism and are less of a consistent and coherent voice than at any time in post-independence history. While individual academics may very well have a role to play in any advocacy of a policy of renewal, I am pessimistic that they possess the coherency and sense of common purpose to act as a group. More profoundly, however, I suggest that Mandle has provided nothing new that would entice and encourage overseas nationals to invest in, much less return to Jamaica. If there is anything to be garnered from the notion of advanced hegemonic dissolution it is that the country is an unstable place for investment and a relatively insecure environment for someone accustomed to the much lower murder and crime rates of London, Boston, or New York. Beyond the advocacy of the strategy, there is a prior action that seems to be required to build trust and lay some foundation of greater social peace that along with the appropriate (and justly administered) forensic and security measures would provide a minimal set of conditions under which the Argonauts might feel comfortable to set sail for home. It is the necessity for this prior action that is the main thrust of Envisioning and derives directly from the initial discussion that Mandle supports, which argues that the country is in a moment of unprecedented socioeconomic crisis and political stasis. If hegemonic dissolution is indeed the case, then the answer cannot be simply located in a set of new policy proposals, but in an unprecedented political move that might release the proverbial logjam and allow the new policies to work.

Where Envisioning decisively falls short is that it does not sufficiently describe and elaborate on the nature of the social forces that will push for and implement this programme of prior action. This however, is an acknowledged weakness which is stated up front, recognizing that in the past the failure to see immediate political solutions has been used as a roadblock to altogether postpone the imagining of alternative futures. I suspect that it is precisely this shortfall that leads Mandle to the pessimistic conclusion that there are no coalitions capable of leading such a renewal (whether initiated via truth commission, land reform, advocacy of a constituent assembly or all the above) and that the way forward is through administrative decisions coming from enlightened university-based intellectuals and implemented by (presumably) enlightened government officials.

Let us for a moment then return to the substantial though limited reference in the conclusion which discusses the potential constituent elements in a new social coalition. In denying that change will come primarily from the
political parties whose members are too compromised from their entanglements with the old system, I go on to propose:

The impetus for change is unlikely to come from this source but from the ranks of the population at large. It is from among the community residents who demonstrate for justice and fairness, the new middle class recruits who join the political parties to initiate constitutional change and the organized working class, who have never been happy with globalization’s race to the bottom, that the call for change is likely to emerge. (p. 175)

If there is a substantial pivot around which there are differences with Mandle’s analysis, it is here. He essentially has a pessimistic view of the possibilities of a “progressive” coalition, while mine are far more optimistic. Where Mandle seems to be in error is in his simplification of the nature of the social forces in Jamaica. On the one side of his analysis are the wealthy classes, which remain powerful and retain a keen interest in keeping things the way they are. On the other side are the garrison communities which, using David Scott’s assessment, are seen as so profoundly disconnected from middle-class morals and civility that they would not be able to function in a system of deliberative democracy as advocated in the book.

Little reference is made to any of the social categories mentioned in my above quote, with the inevitable implication that they have largely migrated to various points in the diaspora, leaving behind two irreconcilable social forces. This is, I think, clearly not the case. It is the existence of a stable if historically shrunken class of employed workers deeply affected by and hostile to the violence and extortion emanating from garrison communities that was a decisive feature of the coalition against the Tivoli Gardens gangster Christopher “Dudus” Coke in May 2010.1 It was this strata’s alliance with lower-middle-class nurses, civil servants, and teachers and upper-middle-class professionals, together with reformist elements in the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturer’s Association that tipped the balance and demanded that the JLP government sever its support for Coke and allow extradition requests from the United States to follow their course.

The coalition proved to be temporary and, despite promising initiatives, has not yet coalesced into a new, vibrant political movement. It does however suggest that the ground is not as infertile as Mandle proposes. Real possibilities exist to form a coalition of the stable that would include these elements, draw on the less compromised and “tribalistic” cadres within both political parties and reach into the garrison communities to win over those inhabitants

who fear the untrammeled power of the local dons. Such a coalition, if operating in the context of a program of social (including land) reform and deeper democracy, might in the right circumstances, outflank both the dons and those among the recalcitrant wealthy who guard the status quo jealously.

In such a framework, Jamaican Argonauts arriving on the beaches of their long lost homeland might actually encounter welcoming embraces rather than the echo of gunfire and the smell of burning tyres.
Brian Meeks’s *Envisioning Caribbean Futures* is an urgently necessary attempt to reclaim the connection between social theory and real-world social change, following the decline of the Caribbean Left and the displacement of Marxian prescriptions. Meeks balances utopianism and pragmatism in his take on Jamaica’s futures, drawing on a broad range of recent critical work to posit what could be termed a post-structuralist political economy for the Caribbean. He uses this theoretical framework to put forth an incisive analysis of Jamaica’s “state of chronic” (as entrepreneur Ezroy Millwood has called it), and to make a number of concrete policy recommendations in search of a way out of this state. In his essay, Jay Mandle reviews *Envisioning Caribbean Futures* and critically assesses the three main initiatives Meeks proposes, concentrating most closely on the possible role of the Jamaican diaspora in fomenting social and economic change.

In this brief essay, I engage with Meeks’s work and Mandle’s response. I respond to their Jamaican “futurigraphy,” and specifically Meeks’s analysis of Jamaica’s social divisions, focusing most closely on urban inequalities and the system of donmanship. I start by commenting briefly on the three policy initiatives set out in the book and reviewed in Mandle’s essay. This is followed by a discussion of the way Meeks, and many others, have approached the fragmentation of urban and larger society, the “two Jamaicas” that have been the topic of debate for so long. Reflecting on the role of dons in the wake of the “Dudus crisis” of 2010 can shed new light on this fragmentation. Reading Meeks’s emphasis on national consensus in relation to the political order of donmanship, I suggest other possibilities for thinking through social difference and the political. I support his well-informed aspirations for Jamaica’s future, and hope to contribute a number of critical observations to this goal.
Mandle recaps Meeks’s main recommendations concisely and assesses their feasibility. I want to add a number of reflections to this. The first regards the process of national reconciliation Meeks proposes but does not elaborate on extensively. Under the guidance of a national reconciliation commission, such a process would address the violence of the 1970s and the associated partisan rifts that have caused and continue to cause so much damage to Jamaican “social living.” While a number of Jamaica’s current problems can indeed be traced back to that period, and its memory is still traumatic to those who suffered through it, its salience for many Jamaicans today might be less than Meeks anticipates. In 2009, 61 percent of Jamaicans were under 35, meaning that the majority of the population does not have any conscious memory of the period (although its traumatic memory may be passed on across generations).

Written in 2007, Meeks’s book could not engage with more recent instances of political and state violence, but to many of Jamaica’s younger inner-city residents this bloodshed may be more relevant. During the “Tivoli massacre” of May 2010 (known in polite circles as the “Tivoli incursion”) that took place as state security forces sought to arrest Christopher “Dudus” Coke, at least 73 civilians were killed, although there are persistent rumors that the body count was much higher. During the state of emergency that lasted from May to July 2010, “curfews” were held in dozens of inner-city communities, in which hundreds of young men were detained, questioned, and fingerprinted without any formal grounds other than their area of residence. In addition, in 2010, the number of police killings (309 deaths, excluding the Tivoli killings) was the highest recorded in any year. What state actors call a war on organized crime is interpreted by many of those who reside in these areas as a war on the poor. Of course, the political violence of the 1970s set the stage for these events in various complex ways. To my mind, the more recent acts of officially sanctioned violence and disrespect and the rifts they cause are equally in need of reconciliation, perhaps in conjunction with the acts of the 1970s. At the time of writing, an official Commission of Enquiry is looking into the “Manatt Phelps Philips” affair in which the U.S. law firm was hired in an attempt to block Dudus’s extradition. While formal and informal commentators agree that the enquiry makes great daytime television, it is a “poppy-show,” an entertaining farce that is not likely to bring about any change in politicians’ integrity or accountability.

The second of Meeks’s recommendations that Mandle addresses is that of land reform. These suggestions are valuable and might well be implemented, at least in part. While Mandle expects “formidable opposition by the country’s
still powerful land-owning class,” Meeks’s proposal is to redistribute government land rather than resort to expropriation of privately owned land. This moderate version of land reform suggests that elite opposition might be much less fierce than the hostility Michael Manley’s attempts at nationalization provoked in the 1970s. The impact of a redistribution of land, however, is likely to be limited. As Mandle points out, a minority of the labor force is involved in agricultural production. More importantly, the hegemonic dissolution that Meeks describes, and the “Caribbean subaltern” with which he concerns himself, are rooted largely in Jamaica’s urban areas. I see no reason for major political opposition to land reform from the urban poor, many of whom have family “in country.” However, there is no indication that a “back-to-the-land” movement would find many adherents amongst inner-city residents, nor is it certain that lack of land is the principal driver for urban drift. While land reform may slow down rural-to-urban migration, it will not solve the pressing issues of urban poverty or social exclusion. Meeks’s (2007:172-73) statement that “all city dwellers would gain from a prosperous countryside, as urban drift would be radically reduced” might risk overestimating the contemporary significance of rural migrants to urban crises, as well as the appeal of rural alternatives to those considering a move to the city.

The final proposal with which Mandle engages is Meeks’s idea of a National Constituent Assembly of Jamaicans at Home and Abroad. This idea and the various associated suggestions for democratic and economic reform are sensible plans to effect a shift of power from politicians to the people (if not all of them are immediately feasible, the processes of constitutional reform in divided countries such as Brazil and Colombia are cause for some optimism). Here, I want to comment briefly on the role Meeks and Mandle ascribe to the Jamaican diaspora. I wonder to what extent Jamaicans “at home” are willing to accept political and economic involvement – or interference – of those who left. The recent debates over the dual citizenship of MPs – and the frustrations many return migrants face – demonstrate an unwillingness to let Jamaican-Americans (or Jamaican-Canadians, Jamaican Brits, etc.) have their cake and eat it. Are Jamaicans in Jamaica interested in being saved by the “transformative agents of change” from the diaspora, who Mandle believes must “thrust Jamaica into economic modernity”? Or would they consider this unwelcome interference from those who turned their backs on their country when the going got tough? The fact that Jamaicans Abroad have something to offer does not necessarily mean Jamaicans at Home are interested in accepting it. Nevertheless, there are various examples of attempts to develop mutually beneficial relations with diaspora communities – such as the Person of Indian Origin (PIO) status developed by India, or Ghana’s Joseph project – and it is certainly worthwhile to explore which

2. See, for example, Potter et al. (2005).
economic and political possibilities are acceptable to Jamaicans both in and outside Jamaica.

JAMAICAN DISSENSUS

Meeks, in his response to Mandle, is correct to point out that Mandle’s focus on economic strategy disregards the necessity of “a prior action that seems to be required to build trust and lay some foundation of greater social peace.” He suggests that Mandle oversimplifies Jamaica’s social categories, representing them as limited to “two irreconcilable social forces.” While there is certainly substance for this charge, I suggest that Meeks’s analysis is open to the same critique. In the conclusion to Envisioning he points to the possibility of a progressive coalition based on solidarity between the working poor, segments of the middle classes, and fed-up members of (presumably inner-city) communities. Yet in his elaboration of hegemonic dissolution, his take on Jamaica’s social fracture seems to follow the “two Jamaicas” narrative, a bipolar split between the wealthy and middle classes on the one hand, and the disenfranchised, socially alienated (urban) poor on the other.

Obviously social realities are much more complex, but it is this classed and raced dichotomy – expressed most clearly, perhaps, in the social distance between “uptown” and “downtown” Kingston – that is dominant in both academic and popular narratives. Meeks (2007:62) adopts it when he speaks of inequality “sharply demarcating the upper middle and upper classes from the rest of the society.” He alludes to it when he quotes Bob Marley’s lyrics from the 1970s: “we nuh know how we and dem a go work this out” (Meeks 2000:52). More recently, dancehall artist Vybz Kartel captured the acrimonious class divide in the track Dem Nuh Like We (“they don’t like us”): “Poor people / dem nuh like we … me granny follow the system / dem treat her like garbage … ghetto yute life don’t mean nutten to dem / five [murders] a day ah the average.” Such narratives draw on what I call “bipolar antagonism,” a specific dualist rhetoric in which social categories are constructed as discrete and antagonistically either/or, rather than both/and. Notwithstanding the reality of multiple gradations, this bipolar rhetoric may complicate the formation of coalitions.

It seems to me that it is this rift between a largely dual, almost irreconcilable “we and them” that Meeks refers to in his book. His emphases on the “Caribbean subaltern” and the declining power of the dominant social bloc imply a contrast between two broad, culturally distinct classes, of oppressors and oppressed. Similarly, his elaboration of hegemonic dissolution evokes this split, as it is characterized by a “popular, subaltern insurgency” and “a widening fissure, from below, from the ways and means of official Jamaican society” (Meeks 2007:77). In seeking to bridge this fissure in his search for national
notes on the state of Chronic

consensus, Meeks cannot escape becoming entangled in the long tradition of “plural society” theories that have been debated in relation to the Caribbean. The underlying question in such debates is always: how can social difference be reconciled with national unity? Meeks’s emphasis on national consensus is reminiscent of what David Scott (2000:287) calls “the Bandung project of the national-modern” in which “difference (religious, ethnic, cultural) is at best a distraction, and at worst a hindrance to the progressive, improving objectives of nation-state building. Difference, on this view, is essentially to be overcome (assimilated, regulated, marginalized, eradicated).”

While the national consensus Meeks seeks to envision does not appear to entail a new hegemony, his proposals can be seen as an attempt to “imagine a progressive convergence on a consensualist ideal” (Scott 2000:296). Envisioning can be understood as an effort to revive “the nationalist modernization project” that Scott (2000:294), using a discussion of the prominent don Zeeks, argues has been subject to dissolution.

In a way, both Meeks’s and Scott’s approaches to Jamaica’s “crisis” echo older discussions on ideology and culture (see Austin 1983). Meeks, as he tries to imagine a replacement for a middle-class Creole hegemony, suggests that a new consensus might be reached through state-sanctioned committees and other reformist measures. While I support these proposals to achieve a more equitable Jamaica, the form of these measures does not necessarily depart from traditional middle-class norms or procedures. Resolving conflict and negotiating (bipolar) antagonism along these lines might risk enforcing a new type of ideological domination. Scott, on the other hand, argues for an understanding of cultural difference and opposition that disregards the integration of different social groups, even if the integrative system is one of inequality and exclusion.

Is there a way of conceptualizing (Caribbean) social difference that finds a middle ground between, on the one hand, the unassimilable, antagonistic divisions posited in Scott’s “permanence of pluralism,” and, on the other, Meeks’s Creolesque insistence on national unity, which has historically proved problematic in its emphasis on acculturation and assimilation? Is it possible to conceive of a situation in which the absence of consensus between different social segments does not necessarily indicate crisis or insurgency, nor does it imply permanent, unbridgeable divides? Without offering any immediate resolutions to these enduring dilemmas, I suggest that the case of Jamaica’s dons presents a compelling metaphor for thinking through difference.

DONS AND DIFFERENCE

The tendency has been to conceive of donmanship as incompatible and competitive with the formal system of democratic statehood. The garrisons over which dons rule have been characterized as “states within a state.” Dudus’s
“Republic of Tivoli” was generally seen as the most developed example of such a parallel or shadow state. The most established dons preside over governance structures that offer alternative, competing forms of justice, security, and welfare, an alternative system of “taxation,” and alternative political rituals such as those evidenced in street dances commemorating or celebrating dons. These state-like entities – often violent, always undemocratic – encroach on the terrain of the formal Jamaican state. They compete with it in terms of service provision, taxation, conscription, and, importantly, a monopoly of the means of coercion. They adopt state-like discourses, for instance when extortion fees are referred to as “taxes.” Dudus was popularly known as “The President” or “Presi,” and his common-law wife went by the moniker of “First Lady.” Ricardo Wynter, the reputed leader of the Stinger Gang in Kingston’s Maxfield Avenue community, went by the nickname of “Government.”

However, the entanglement of the dons’ power structures with the formal political system and state bureaucracy suggests that we should think beyond “parallel states” that engage in competition. Rather, the two systems exist in collaboration. Dons continue to function as important inner-city gatekeepers, not only for politicians, but for government agencies and bureaucrats as well. Various MPs and government officials (as well as businesspeople and NGO workers) spoke to me of the pragmatic necessity and even efficiency of working with dons. Conversely, dons rely on politicians and state bureaucracies for the government contracts that provide a significant portion of their income. In these aspects, the system of donmanship does not engage in competition with the formal state.

It has become increasingly difficult to understand Jamaica’s formal and informal systems of rule and belonging as distinct. Urban governance is achieved through a hybrid, composite system of actors and mechanisms of maintaining order, with various shifting yet enduring coalitions between state actors and criminal organizations. Politicians and state actors use dons to pursue public goods as well as private interests, while dons use them in return with the same objectives. Inner-city residents may access certain public goods through this system of order, but ultimately they suffer. Meanwhile, the formal state and the dons’ informal state have come to form a mutually expedient symbiosis in which sovereignty is shared and capital accumulated. I suggest that we can understand these compound governance structures as “hybrid states,” in which criminal organizations and the formal state are entangled in a relationship of collusion and divestment, sharing control over urban spaces and populations.

Might we take this phenomenon of symbiotic entanglement at the level of governance as a metaphor for the way Jamaica’s different classed and cultural segments are organized? I would never endorse this hybrid state as a positive model of governance and, as outlined above, its benefits to inner-city residents are few. Rather than positing this hybrid form of governance as
a suggestion for reform, I suggest it might be useful as a metaphor for how diversity is organized, offering a slightly different way of conceptualizing the articulation of multiple cultural-political orders within one nation-state. Like these different forms of governance, Jamaica’s various social categories (uptown, downtown, and their gradations and variations) are distinct yet entangled, separate yet mutually constitutive, competitive yet interdependent. These different class/cultural/ethnic/geographical categories can shape-shift rhetorically, expanding, contracting, and splintering over time, with actors within one category aligning with actors from another at one moment, only to oppose them in the next instance. The antagonisms need not be permanent, nor the fractures insuperable. Yet the coalitions will most likely not be stable either, and strategic temporary unity will not result in cultural assimilation.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Perhaps the social glue that Meeks seeks is to be found not so much in the consensus itself, but in the existing interlinkages and ongoing dialogue between Jamaica’s different social categories, those links and encounters that a rhetoric of bipolar antagonism studiously disregards. Dissensus within a nation-state need not be the main cause of crisis — indeed, it is inevitable. Rather than focusing on which specific consensual coalition is capable of emerging, it might be more important to emphasize and cultivate the fora for working through different opinions, values, and (economic) interests. Such possibilities — agonistic rather than antagonistic — are in fact most evident in Meeks’s proposal of a constituent assembly. For Jamaica, such an assembly would be a new forum for such meetings and debates, a new mode of working through difference without denying it.

As Maeckelbergh (2009) shows for the alterglobalization movement, attention to the process of organization and decision-making itself — rather than to specific goals or ideas — can entail a productive democratic shift. Moving from the question who rules? to the question how do we rule? means that common processes and practices (of practical decision-making) rather than common values can create a basis for collective action in contexts of diversity. Is it possible to focus on (or at least start out by) limiting consensus to specific, practical situations (as in effect Meeks advocates when he proposes that the constituent assembly start with adjudicating land reform), rather than demanding consensus for larger abstractions such as “a vision for the future of Jamaica”? Grounding Caribbean futures in very concrete and pragmatic forms of productive conflict — starting small, but dreaming big — as Meeks has begun to do in Envisioning Caribbean Futures, is perhaps the best hope we have for dismantling the state of chronic.
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Rivke Jaffe believes discussion of what to do in Jamaica should move from the question of who rules (the analytic foundation of Meeks’s essay) to that of “how do we rule.” Doing so, she writes, would make it “possible to focus on (or at least start out by) limiting consensus to specific practical situations … rather than demanding consensus for large abstractions such as ‘a vision for the future of Jamaica.’” Citing Maeckelbergh, Jaffe believes that “attention to the process of organization and decision-making itself – rather than to specific goals or ideas – can entail a productive democratic shift” (emphasis in original). In this she seeks a middle ground between the view traceable back to M.G. Smith’s conception of a plural society that posits an unbridgeable gap between classes and groups and “Meeks’s Creolesque insistence on national unity.”

The disagreement between Meeks and Jaffe is crystallized in their attitudes towards urban dons. Meeks finds hope and the basis for Jamaican renewal in the alliance of the country’s employed workers, “deeply affected by and hostile to the violence and extortion emanating from garrison communities” and “lower-middle-class nurses, civil servants, and teachers and upper-middle-class professionals together with reformist elements in the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturer’s Association.” That coalition, he writes, “tipped the balance and demanded that the JLP government sever its support of [Christopher “Dudus”] Coke.” Jaffe in contrast argues that “criminal organizations and the formal state are entangled in a relationship of collusion and divestment, sharing control over urban spaces and populations.” While making clear that she “would never endorse this hybrid state as a positive model of governance,” Jaffe nevertheless argues that “the social glue that Meeks seeks” is not to be found in a new consensus formed by a reforming coalition, a project that risks “enforcing a new type of ideological domination.” Instead Jaffe believes “that emphasis should be placed on cultivating the fora “for working through different opinions, values, and (economic) interests” that result from the hybrid governing structure.”
Only experience will allow a judgment to be made between these contrasting views. Both possess deep vulnerabilities. Jaffe’s position depends on the good will of urban bosses who have not revealed any particular interest in dialogue and discussion. But at the same time, the reforming coalition that Meeks pins his hopes upon is at best fragile, not having as he puts it, “yet coalesced into a new vibrant political movement.” Meeks takes the coalition’s presence in the Coke conflict as indicating that the political ground is not as “infertile” as I suggest, but at this moment in time his optimism is more hope than reality.

The fact remains that if Jamaica is to become anything other than an insular backwater in the globalizing world order, it is Meeks’s hypothesis that should command the efforts of political organizers. It might be true that the hybrid politics described by Jaffe could sustain itself in a long-term equilibrium. But it is very unlikely that the tradeoffs between the official and unofficial world of politics required by that model will serve the country well. Contrary to Jaffe’s view, a vision of the future is essential for Jamaica to develop the productive dexterity that will determine its degree of success in a world no longer dominated by a single superpower and in which previously poor countries become masters of modern technology.

It is in this regard that the human capital and entrepreneurial capacities present in the Jamaican diaspora have an important, perhaps even central, role to play. Meeks of course is right that my paper does not elaborate the steps needed for the implementation of the “Argonauts Strategy.” And certainly Jaffe makes a valid point in questioning whether Jamaican’s “At Home” will have much interest in initiatives undertaken by Jamaicans “Abroad.” But neither of these reservations should be thought of as determinant. In 1977 no one believed that China would reach out successfully to Overseas Chinese for assistance in the country’s economic development. Yet a few short years after the ending of the Cultural Revolution that is precisely what occurred. The same can happen in Jamaica.

Much has changed in the Caribbean since M.G. Smith and R.T. Smith waged their epic struggles over the nature of Caribbean societies. Growth has been slow, but it has occurred. There are many more well-educated individuals constituting a middle stratum of society than in the 1960s. As a result there is more coherence to these societies than M.G. envisioned, though regretfully, not as much as R.T. thought he observed. Part of this grouping found opportunities abroad but would, under the right circumstances, return home. The task for domestic activists is to work to create the conditions that would encourage such a return. In this, Meeks’s approach to reform has much more to commend it than does Jaffe’s.
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These three ostensibly very different books tell a compelling story of each author’s approach, as much as the subject matter itself. *Fidel Castro: My Life: A Spoken Autobiography* is based on a series of long interviews granted by the then-president of Cuba, Fidel Castro, to Spanish-Franco journalist Ignacio Ramonet. *Cuba: What Everyone Needs to Know*, by U.S. political analyst Julia Sweig, is one of a set country series, and, like Ramonet’s, presented in question/answer format. *An Island Called Home: Returning to Jewish Cuba*, with a narrative by Cuban-American anthropologist Ruth Behar and photographs by Cuban photographer Humberto Mayol, is a retrospective/introspective account of the Jewish presence in Cuba. While from Ramonet and Sweig we learn much about the revolutionary project, Behar and Mayol convey the lived experience of the small Jewish community against that backdrop.

Ignacio Ramonet begins his introduction to *Fidel Castro* by describing the setting of Castro’s personal office in the Palacio de la Revolución, in the early hours of the morning, with the aging but pre-illness leader tireless amidst revered icons: Latin American independence leaders Simón Bolívar and Antonio José de Sucre, Cuba’s independence leader José Martí and North America’s Abraham Lincoln, along with Cervantes’s fictional Don Quixote astride his steed Rocinante, co-revolutionary Camilo Cienfuegos (tragically killed soon after the 1959 triumph of the Revolution), writer Ernest
Hemingway, and his Galician-born father Angel Castro. The scene is set for the book’s depiction of Castro as liberator of the Americas, fighter for ideals, a man of culture, a son.

Ramonet had the idea for the book in 2002, when he was in Cuba for the Havana Book Fair, after publishing his (shorter) conversations with Mexico’s Zapatista Subcomandante Marcos. Joseph Stiglitz, the winner of the 2001 Nobel Prize for Economics, was also there, and the two of them engaged in conversation with El Comandante over the alternative globalization movement. Among his reasons for wishing to do the book was making known to younger generations the Fidel Castro who had erupted onto the global stage over half a century ago, lived through and been protagonist of some of the most convulsive moments of those years, and led Cuba’s continuing defence of socialism and noncapitulation to the neoliberal “Third Way” conventional wisdom of the post-1989 world. In Ramonet’s view, “Whether his detractors like it or not, Fidel Castro has a place in the pantheon of world figures who have struggled most fiercely for social justice and with greatest solidarity come to the aid of the oppressed” (p. 11).

Ramonet knew Castro was unlikely to write his own autobiography, so proposed the long interview format, giving him full control over the final text, to amend and add where he saw fit. He had no intention of interrogating, inquisitorial fashion, but rather of eliciting a “personal interpretation” (p. 17). Long sessions in January-March 2003 produced a first draft, already longer by far than four previous works, but new events, including the Iraq war, occasioned the need to fill in gaps and more sessions in late 2004 and again in late 2005. Finally, notes were added. The first edition came out in Spain in April 2006, and in Cuba a month later, before Castro, due to “obligations of state,” had personally read it. Then he started reading with a fine eye, completing it after his August 2006 surgery and temporary secession of power to his brother Raúl – subsequently to become permanent in February 2008.

There have been various iterations and titles of the book. It appeared in Spanish as Cien horas con Fidel (o Fidel Castro: biografía a dos voces) (“A Hundred Hours with Fidel [or Fidel Castro: A Biography in Two Voices]”), and in French as Fidel Castro: biographie à deux voix – titles that perhaps more aptly capture a book which is neither biography nor autobiography, but rather a series of questions and answers around key topics, from childhood up to the present, but omitting any reference to Castro’s adult personal life. Most informative is translator Andrew Hurley’s note in the English-language edition (pp. 627-30), in which he recounts how he originally worked from the proof pages for the first Spanish edition, supplemented by corrections as it went to press. Then a new set of proofs was sent him for a completely revised and restructured Spanish edition, some one hundred pages longer, to be used for the English-language version. So began the gargantuan task of tallying all the changes Castro had made. For those interested in comparing the finer points, all editions are in the public domain.
Much ground has been covered in previous studies, as also the voluminous speeches given and various accounts and books penned by Castro. However, there are new facets and nuances, from the vantage point of hindsight, some occasioning further questions in this reader. In the context of Cuba’s contemporary emphasis on health and its humanitarian involvement in neighboring Haiti, how formative was the Haitian black presence in Castro’s early life, in Birán and in Santiago de Cuba, and his early experience of the Santiago Spanish community’s cooperative medical facilities? And what of his assessment that there was no class consciousness in 1950s Cuba, except among those in the Popular Socialist Party, whom he describes as having more of a class instinct than class consciousness?

Critical moments in history are glossed over, such as slavery, worker struggles, and the revolution’s treatment of homosexuals. Ambivalence over the death penalty contrasts with vociferous condemnation of U.S. covert “fifth column” tactics to bring down the Revolution. Yet, Ramonet’s final introductory words hold: “In the winter of his life and now, due to health concerns, a little distanced from power, he is still driven to defend the energy revolution, the environment, against neoliberal globalization and internal corruption. He is still down in the trenches, on the front line, leading the battle for the ideas he believes in – ideas which, apparently, nothing and no one will ever make him give up” (p. 21).

For Julia Sweig, *Cuba: What Everyone Needs to Know* was a personal journey of a different kind. She, too, opens her introduction with images: of a first visit to Cuba in 1984 as a student, sitting in a Havana park beside the imposing, modernist sculpture of Don Quixote and his Rocinante, watching youths in the park and reflecting on the lack of branding in Cuba at the time – except for the brand name of Fidel Castro, whose presence she describes as ubiquitous. Many trips later, in 2008, she reflected on how, while in some ways unchanged, in others Cuba had become almost unrecognizable, most notably for the absence of Castro. It wasn’t that he had evaporated, but she saw and felt a Cuba that was moving on. She returned to the park and found it filled with an open-air market of vendors selling food, clothing, books, and jewelry – “an urban scene that could easily have been plucked from any city in Latin America” (p. xxi).

The emphasis of her book is on the U.S.-Cuba relationship and explaining why Cuba under Raúl and its next leaders will in all likelihood continue defying imperial power. The fundamental question she sets out to answer is why the revolution has endured beyond the cold war and the half-century in which Castro was in power. Some of the answers, she states, might seem obvious to those outside the United States, who have had more contact with Cuba, but contrast with the prevailing U.S. belief that Washington should somehow manage regime change on this island just 90 miles away. Patently not a book about the personality of one man, or one man and his brother, this is rather an attempt to explain Cuba’s trajectory, domestically and on the
world stage, which has both shaped and been shaped by them. Her goal is to paint a Cuba that is “far more textured and complex than the romanticized myth still resonating from that sculpture in Havana” (p. xxii).

Sweig has crafted an excellent and well-written overview with the U.S. reader in mind, highlighting some of the better- and lesser-known episodes in both historical and contemporary periods. The pre-1959 chapter is brief, dominated by the late nineteenth-century overthrow of Spanish colonial rule in what came to be known as the Spanish-American war (a term that with the stroke of a pen obliterated thirty years of Cubans’ struggle for independence) followed by U.S. military occupation and the then overwhelming U.S. presence in Cuba up until the 1959 revolution. The reference to jingoist impulses of Manifest Destiny shaping U.S. opinion is salutary: “You furnish the pictures, and I’ll furnish the war,” was Randolph Hearst’s famous comment to one of his cartoonists covering the Spanish-[Cuban]-American conflict (p. 10).

For the non-U.S. reader what perhaps stands out most is not only the attempt to demystify the U.S.-Cuba axis but what tends to get left out. Omissions in coverage of the pre-1959 period include the role played by reinvigorated Spanish investment and immigration after independence, the continuing economic presence of other powers such as Great Britain, class analysis to match that of race, and attention to how intertwined Cuban and U.S. culture had become by the 1950s. There are some cavalier journalistic turns of phrase, no doubt designed to enliven the reading, but which can be read as somewhat derogatory: references, for example, to the nineteenth-century “rag-tag rebel army” (p. 6) and “the ‘revolt’ of members of the rogue Independent Party of Color” (p. 13), or the remark that “the 26th of July was not the only game in town” (p. 22).

The bulk of the book is on the post-1959 period, divided chronologically into three periods: between the 1959 revolution and the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union; the years 1991-2006; and the post-2006, post-Fidel (if not post-Castro) era. Each is subdivided into domestic, U.S.-Cuba and “Cuba in the World” sections. The book’s strengths lie in the informed and even-handed coverage of the domestic and U.S.-Cuba axis, yet there are again omissions: examples are the role of western Europe in the earlier period, and the Caribbean, in the earlier period when newly independent former British territories began to break the blockade and in the 1990s when they crucially stood up to their powerful northern neighbor over Cuba policy. There are also more occasional sleights of the pen, as in Castro on his triumphal march into Havana “kissing babies, tussling hair” accompanied by his “rabble rebel clan” (p. 36).

In An Island Called Home, Ruth Behar steers us away from the meta-narrative to the very particular lived experience of Cuba’s small Jewish community. As in much of Behar’s work, intertwined in this account is a very personal journey to the island of which she states she has no first-hand memories (having been taken away as a child of five), only old family photographs and stories. The island, however, has haunted her adult life.
The opening sentence of her first overview chapter “Running Away From Home to Run Toward Home” reads: “You’re going to Cuba again? What did you lose in Cuba?” That was what her grandmother Esther, her Baba, would say when she stayed over to see her in Miami en route to Havana. She would say it in Spanish, although her mother tongue was Yiddish. She was from Poland and had immigrated to Cuba in 1927, aged 19. There she married and worked to get the rest of the family to safety from the Nazi Holocaust. After Castro came to power, she left Cuba for the United States; and there her granddaughter grew up, wondering about the home from which she’d been taken. Behar’s first visit was in 1979, but it was in the 1990s that she compulsively kept going back, able to go as an academic when family visits were not allowed. It was losing Baba, who died in 2000, that was the impetus for the book. In Behar’s words: “What began as a vague desire to find my lost home in Cuba gradually became a more concrete search for the Jews who make their homes in Cuba today” (p. 3).

The history of the Jewish presence in Cuba dates back at least to 1492 and conversos – Spanish Jewish converts to Catholicism otherwise facing banishment – who travelled with Columbus to the New World. Little is known about these and other early Sephardic immigrants from Spain, but in the early twentieth century practising Jews came from the United States, along with Sephardic Jews who had fled to Turkey and were subsequently fleeing the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, and then Ashkenazic Jews, largely from Poland, escaping the pogroms and rising anti-Semitism – hence the term polaco, Pole, used by Cubans to refer to Jews.

Many went to Cuba seeing the island as a stepping stone to the United States, which a quota system placed out of bounds. In Yiddish, the island was called Asksanie Kuba, Hotel Cuba, a temporary lodging; but for many, like Behar’s Baba and Russian grandfather, the hotel became home; they became peddlers, selling their wares for credit; and their situation was precarious, as they were not allowed to become Cuban citizens.

It is misleading for Behar to state: “Black workers from Jamaica and Haiti also tried to immigrate to Cuba as agricultural laborers, but most were turned away” (p. 6). The reference is presumably to the 1930s deportations with the Cuban nationality act, but many did stay, and in far greater numbers than the Jewish community at any point. After the creation of the Israeli state in 1948, some left to build Kibbutz Gaash, but the majority stayed. Assistance from U.S. Jewish organizations, especially the Hebrew Immigrant Aid society (HIAS) and Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) became important to these “Jewish Robinson Crusoes who had to ‘make their America in Cuba’” (p. 8). By the late 1950s, there were an estimated 15,000-16,500 out of a population of six million, including some wealthy merchant enterprises and many small-time businesses (Jewish synagogues, media, associations, kosher cafés and stores), and, in Behar’s words, Jewish-Communist ideals had given way
to solid middle-class Jewish values. This came almost to an end with the exodus of an estimated 90-96 percent to the United States by 1965.

They left with only a suitcase and no valuables, but invariably their family photographs. Behar intersperses her own in the book, along with those of Cuban photographer Humberto Mayol, whom she asked to accompany her in search of what remains of the Jewish presence today. As they were to discover, “what remains” does not exactly capture what has been essentially a reconstruction and reinvention of the Jewish community since the 1990s.

The unfolding presence/absence of the Jewish community in Cuba is above all framed by cataclysmic events in global history – from Spain’s discovery for Europe of the New World, through the rise and fall of the Ottoman Empire, Nazi Germany, and the Soviet bloc. What began as a search for a past came to document a post-1989 Jewish revival, with the removed stigma of religion and flow of U.S. dollars from Canadian and U.S. Jewish organizations (including the JDC). An old tallit (prayer shawl), long hidden away, was brought out; a torah was restored to its rightful place; synagogues and Jewish cemeteries were repaired; grown men were circumcised; and Operation Cigar enabled immigration to Israel, in itself a new stepping stone to the United States. What Behar and Mayol portray is a poignant new Jewish-Cuban fusion geared to economic survival with political and religious beliefs such that men can wear the tallit over t-shirts bearing the image of Che Guevara.

Castro, in answer to one of Ramonet’s questions, refers to having as a child been called “the Jew.” That was what people who hadn’t been baptized were called, but he reflected on it as anti-Semitic religious prejudice of the time. Sweig recounts how it was President Ronald Reagan’s first national security advisor Richard Allen who recommended that Jorge Mas Canosa and his Cuban American National Foundation closely study the American-Israeli Political Action Committee, whereby Cuban Americans could exert their legitimate citizen rights in shaping U.S. Cuba policy. It is Behar, however, “an anthropologist with an aching heart,” feeling like her two Jewish grandfathers that she had “a bundle on her shoulders,” in her self-ascribed role “to carry these memories back and forth,” (p. 34) who punches home the ramifications for being Jewish on the island.
Our greatest frustration, as longtime book review editors, is silence – lack of any sort of reply when we ask a colleague to consider reviewing a book. Our favorite response, of course, is an acceptance (sometimes beautifully phrased, as in “It would be an honor once again to review a book in the NWIG”). Our next favorite is a polite demurral accompanied by a suggestion or two for who else to ask (including contact information). But silence, followed some weeks later when we repeat the request by further silence, really slows up the process of getting information about books to NWIG readers. Fortunately, once people agree to review a book, almost all do a terrific job and turn in their reviews more or less on time. (Each year, we receive letters asking for a several-week extension from a review’s due date – that’s something we’re always happy to grant.) To all these cooperative, even enthusiastic reviewers, we offer our heartfelt thanks.

But there are always a few people who agree to write a review and then, despite multiple reminders, cannot seem to get the job done. Therefore, it is once again our solemn duty to induct this select group of scholars into the Caribbeanist Hall of Shame. Despite cordial reminders over a period of many months, these colleagues have neither produced the reviews that they promised nor returned the books so that someone else could take on the task. As is our custom, and in an attempt to exercise discretion and protect the reputation of innocent Caribbeanists, we follow the eighteenth-century convention in identifying delinquent reviewers by first and last initials.

*Cuban Zarzuela: Performing Race and Gender on Havana’s Lyric Stage*, by Susan Thomas (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008. xii + 264 pp., cloth US$ 40.00) (J—l L—e)


As usual, we begin our annual review of books that are not otherwise reviewed in the New West Indian Guide with fiction.

Myriam J.A. Chancy’s *The Loneliness of Angels* (Leeds, U.K.: Peepal Tree Press, 2010, paper US$ 22.95) is a gripping second novel by this Haitian-Canadian author, exploring spirituality and memory in Pétionville and Port-au-Prince, as well as in the diaspora in Montreal, Miami, and Paris, with the everyday horrors of Duvalierism transmogrified through dreams, Vaudou, and escape, as an extended family comes alive in this nonlinear narrative that continues to grow on the reader. *Aunt Résia and the Spirits and Other Stories* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010, cloth US$ 55.00) brings Haitian modernist Yanick Lahens’s first short story collection, lauded here by Edwige Danticat in a Foreword and Marie-Agnès Sourieau in an Afterword, and which was published in French in 1994, to an Anglophone audience. Lahiny Pierre’s *General Authority* (Tokyo: Blue Ocean Press, 2010, paper US$ 16.95), written in wobbly English, appears to be a first novel by a Haitian woman living in the United States, and deals with political violence, migration, and other familiar Haitian realities. *En attendant la montée des eaux* (Paris: Editions Jean-Claude Lattès, 2010, paper € 19.00), Maryse Condé marshals her storytelling art to spin a tale that weaves between some of her favorite places – Mali, where the main character is born, Guadeloupe, where he lives, and Haiti, his adopted daughter’s homeland. *Drive: L’errance ensorcelée* (Paris: HC Editions, 2009, paper € 14.50), edited by anthropologist Gerry L’Etang, presents more than a dozen brief fictions (some in French, some in Creole) by as many authors, all concerning that peculiar Martiniquan malady, “la drive,” which haunts local crackheads, alcoholics, and people suffering from a variety of social/family ills. Candace Ward and Tim Watson have produced a definitive critical edition of Cynric R. Williams’s 1827 Jamaican novel *Hamel, the Obeah Man* (Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Editions, 2010, paper US$ 21.95), with a brief foreword by Kamau Brathwaite. Finally, Peepal Tree Press (Leeds, U.K.) has started publishing an outstanding series called Caribbean Modern Classics – fiction from the 1950s and 1960s. We’ve received Andrew Salkey’s *Escape to an Autumn Pavement* (2009, paper £8.99), originally published in 1960 – a strong novel about a Jamaican making his way in 1950s London as he questions his sexual orientation. Other authors (some with multiple titles) in this very welcome series include: Austin Clarke, Jan Carew, O.R. Dhathorne, Neville Dawes, Wilson Harris, Marion Patrick Jones, Earl Lovelace, Edgar Mittelholzer, Denis Williams, Roger Mais, Elma Napier, Orlando Patterson, V.S. Reid, and Garth St. Omer.

Turning to poetry, two from the masters. *White Egrets: Poems* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010, cloth US$ 24.00) is Derek Walcott’s fourteenth collection, published in his eightieth year. Soaring pentameters, elegiac reflections on growing old, and the physicality of St. Lucia are ever-present, with “bannered breakers” rolling in toward ochre and “shadow-plunged valleys,” fishing villages, flocks of “impeccable egrets” (which become the “bleached regrets of an old man’s memoirs”) – it’s all here. There
are long moments traveling in Spain and Italy, many goodbyes to friends, explicit disappointment at his own long-practiced skills in painting, and reflections “quietly on how soon I will be going,” along with the wish “to paint and write well in what could be my last year.” If it’s not Omeros, it’s still a wondrous thing. As Walcott insists here: “The perpetual ideal is astonishment.”

Meanwhile, Kamau Brathwaite unveils Elegguas [spelled with a snake spiraling up between the two g’s] (Middletown CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010, cloth US$ 22.95), a series of elegiac offerings to the dead (“Those who i hold most dear / are nvr dead ... / mixed with my sand and mortar / they walk in me with the world”), including love letters to his wife Zea Mexican (“And you my love? Can you see me? / Hear me? Are you close by? ... What is it like & / how is it w/you across the water/or is / there nothing nothing at all / as I think you xpected as I think yu / sometimes say tho i not too too sure / about that”), a poem for Walter Rodney (“to be blown into fragments, your flesh / like the islands that you love / like the seawall that you wish to heal”), and much more, all in his inimitable tidelectic nation language printed in SycoraX Video Style font. Deeply affecting poems.


Christine Craig’s collection, Poems: All Things Bright & Quadrille for Tigers (Leeds, U.K.: Peepal Tree Press, 2010, paper £9.99), combines new work (the first part of the title) that evinces what she calls “a Caribbean metaphysical poetics” with her first volume of poetry (the Quadrille) originally published in 1984 – together, they constitute literary, thoughtful reflections about the Jamaica of her childhood from the perspective of Fort Lauderdale, where she now lives. In Looking Out, Looking In: New and Selected Poems

*Beyond Borders: Cross-Culturalism and the Caribbean Canon* (Kingston: University of the West Indies Press, 2009, paper US$ 35.00), edited by Jennifer Rahim & Barbara Lalla, includes essays that originated at a 2004 cultural studies conference at UWI St. Augustine and features contributions by various Caribbean luminaries, including a rewarding essay on language and the politics of ethnicity by George Lamming.

Two on Caribbean art, broadly conceived. Anne Walmsley and Stanley Greaves introduce their edited book, *Art in the Caribbean: An Introduction* (London: New Beacon Books, 2010, paper £20.00), as “a virtual art gallery, enabling a selection of artworks made in the region to be widely seen and studied” (p. vii). In fact, it’s much more. One artwork by each of forty artists (“weighted toward the Anglophone Caribbean,” but also including Dutch, French, and Hispanic representation) is reproduced in color, with helpful commentary on both the work and the artist on a facing page. This richly contextualized “gallery” is followed by “Historical Background,” 85 densely packed pages covering 1500 through 2009, organized chronologically and by “region” (particular islands, Dutch Caribbean, etc.). In short, an excellent introduction to Caribbean art by two veteran participants in the region’s cultural life. *Imaging the Caribbean: Culture and Visual Translation*, by Patricia Mohammed (Oxford, U.K.: Macmillan Caribbean, 2009, paper £26.75), heavily illustrated, is a laudable but overambitious attempt to analyze Caribbean iconography created both within and beyond the region, over a 500-year period. Its selectivity and omissions suggest how much authorial
and editorial effort a more complete such project would entail. And accuracy would help. For example, the famous engraving made by William Blake after a watercolor by John Gabriel Stedman (one of the rare non-insular images in the text), which was originally published as “A Surinam Planter in his Morning Dress,” is here captioned “Illustration from John Steadman, Narrative ... Unknown artist, pen and ink drawing.”

Antonio Martorell has once again shared his explosive creativity, this time taking off from El Velorio (The Wake), the best known painting of the famous nineteenth-century Puerto Rican Realist artist, Francisco Oller y Cestero. In El Velorio / Martorell’s Wake (2010, spiral-bound, with a CD included, US$ 59.95, mischievously listed as published by “Ediciones R.I.P” and available from edicionesrip@antoniomartorell.com), we see (on versos) the painting over and over – in color, black-and-white, faded, darkened, lightened, inverted, upended, scrawled over, washed out, crumpled up, invaded by other images, reduced to a series of hats, and cropped down to any number of details. Each incarnation inspires a text (both Spanish and English, on rectos) from Martorell’s boundless imagination and inventive intellect. The voices behind these first-person narratives vary from the painting itself (who addresses the author) and various objects depicted therein, to the canvas, the title, the museum guard, particular colors, and even the dead child whose wake is being celebrated – offering a sancocho of ruminations on Puerto Rican history, tradition, art criticism, reality, illusion, cuisine, arrogance, fame, religion, race, class, sex, hypocrisy, music, life, death, ... need we go on?

design featuring postcards and party invitations you can remove from their envelopes, a CD, and other memorabilia documenting the whole history of this remarkable cultural phenomenon. Martinique Ltd: Photographies présentées à « Kréyol factory » du 7 avril au 5 juillet 2009. Une exposition d’art contemporain sur la diversité des mondes créoles au cœur de la Grande Hall, Parc de la Villette (Gros Morne, Martinique: Trace Éditions, 2009, paper € 20.00) is a striking collection of images by Martinique’s premier photographer, Jean-Luc de Léguerique. In the words of preface writer Guillaume Pigéard de Gurbert, the project was intended “to photograph in their very invisibility the global forces which are destroying Martinique.” Haunting, memorable, and disturbing, it is a resounding success. Rock Art of the Caribbean (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2009, paper US$ 30.95), edited by Michele Hayward, Lesley-Gail Atkinson & Michael Cinquino, includes surveys by diverse scholars on the phenomenon in Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, as well as useful bibliography and an overview of the field.

A number of Suriname books deserve mention. In Alles voor de vrede: De brieven van Boston Band tussen 1757 en 1763 (Amsterdam: NINsee/Amrit, 2009, paper € 15.00), Frank Dragtstein analyzes the extraordinary life of the man whom present-day Ndyukas call Adyáko Benti Basiton, who was (possibly) born in Africa, served as a slave in Jamaica where he became literate in English, was brought to Suriname in about 1749, marooned to the Ndyukas, served between 1757 and 1763 as Ndyuka scribe and leader during the events surrounding the 1760 Ndyuka treaty-signing with the Dutch, and died in 1766. The book is weakened by its inexplicable refusal to engage non-written traces of the past – as Michiel van Kempen pointed out in his own review (in Siboga 20[1], 2010:40-42), Dragtstein engages neither André Pakosie’s work on the period nor Alabi’s World, which covers the same period and some of the exact same events. In appendices, the book presents contemporary Dutch translations of Boston’s eighteen known letters (none of the original English letters have survived). There is some irony that – in a work purporting to show the perspective of the “victims of Suriname slavery,” in this case a recent maroon – the analysis is based solely on archival data. Given the methodological significance of developments in Suriname Maroon historiography for the study of Atlantic slavery over the past few decades, this book’s exclusive attention to colonial documents seems a wasted opportunity.

The newest large-format glossy from members of the Libi Na Wan cooperative (based in Kourou, French Guiana) is Karol Barthélémy’s Den taki foe a Tembe: Les paroles du tembe (Gariès, France: Éditions Roger Le Guen, 2009, paper € 29). Like other LNW publications, it has stunning photographic reproductions of scenery and art objects, but a text that opts largely for popular myths rather than serious scholarship. It begins by proposing that maroon art began in the seventeenth century as a system of symbols designed to show
runaway slaves the paths through the forest to safety (p. 21). Artists’ names are sometimes indicated and sometimes ignored (even when readily accessible, for example, in museum documentation); vine-grown gourds are identified as tree-grown calabashes (see N Wig 56:69-82 for clarification of this misunderstanding); and the reading of motifs as communicative devices continues the LNW tradition of presenting Maroon art as a symbolic language.

Schaafjjs & wilde bussen: Straatkunst in Suriname, by Tammo Schuringa, Paul Faber & Chandra van Binnendijk (Amsterdam: KIT Publishers, 2010, paper € 19.50) presents wonderful color images and intelligent text about Suriname’s lively street art – wall painting but also, and particularly, the pictures painted on the ubiquitous shaved-ice carts and on mini-buses. Special attention is paid to certain areas: rear mudguards and the flip-lids that hide buses’ fuel tanks. The book coincides with a 2010 exhibition in the Centrum voor Beeldende Kunst in Amsterdam Zuid-Oost. Paramaribo Span: Contemporary Art in Suriname (Amsterdam: KIT Publishers, 2010, paper € 25.00), edited by Thomas Meijer zu Schlochtern & Christopher Cozier, is a wide-ranging, illustrated compilation, with varied art and cultural criticism by a number of authors, offering a good sense of the vibrant cultural scene. It doesn’t shy away from controversy, e.g. in the debate about “culture houses” (museums run by Maroons or Indigenous peoples), and is somewhat relaxed about ethnographic/historical details (e.g., it claims that “Afaka [was] once the language of the N’dyuka Maroons,” rather than being a literally dreamed-up syllabic script dating from 1908 that was learned by two or three dozen Ndyukas and more recently resuscitated by the talented Ndyuka artist Marcel Pinas). The book is available in Dutch and Portuguese editions from the same publisher. Paramaribo in Pictures, by Toon Fey with photos by Hijn Bijnen, Hedwig “Plu” de la Fuente & others (Paramaribo: VACO, 2010, cloth € 16.00 [outside Suriname, € 19.90]) is 16 x 16cm, with seven pages of English/Dutch text followed by more than 250 single-page, unidentified color images of the city – people, buildings, festivals, and street scenes. Its audience or purpose remains a mystery to us.

Kijkkasten uit Suriname: De diorama’s van Gerrit Schouten, by Clazien Medendorp (Amsterdam: KIT Publishers, 2008, paper € 19.50) is a detailed, color-illustrated presentation of the twenty-seven dioramas made by Suriname’s “most important artist of the nineteenth century” depicting Paramaribo, sugar plantations, slave dances, Amerindian life, and more in the first three decades of the century, and comes complete with a set of 3-D glasses. The 98-page De Marronvrouw in de stad: Een historische analyse van de gevolgen van de urbanisatie voor de Marronvrouwen in Suriname, by Martina Amoksi (Amsterdam: NINsee/Amrit, 2009, paper € 15.00), is a pioneer publication by a Ndyuka Maroon woman and seems to be a revised master’s thesis from the Anton de Kom University. On its cover it claims to be “the first systematic research centered on the Maroon woman” – but how
about Co-Wives and Calabashes (1984, second edition 1993)? Well-meaning but in every sense thin, the book summarizes Maroon history from the beginning, before discussing urbanization since the mid-twentieth century. *Kind aan de ketting: Opgroeien in slavernij toen en nu*, edited by Aspha Bijnaar (Amsterdam: KIT Publishers, 2010, paper € 26.50) complements an exhibition at NINsee in Amsterdam designed to show the prominence of children in slavery. Chapters by well-known scholars, such as Alex van Stipriaan and Wim Rutgers, cover Suriname and Netherlands Antilles slavery, with shorter sections on Dutch painting and current child slavery in the world. A serious, nicely illustrated work.

Rosemarijn Hoeft has kindly offered information on several Dutch publications that won’t otherwise be reviewed in NWIG. *Atlantisch avontuur: De Lage Landen, Frankrijk en de expansie naar het westen, 1500-1800* (Zutphen, the Netherlands: Walburg Pers, 2010, cloth € 39.50) is a lavishly illustrated volume on French-Dutch connections in the Atlantic world; edited by historians Piet Emmer, Henk den Heijer & Louis Sicking, it is intended for non-academic readers. Another beautifully produced book is *Dromers, doemdenkers en doorzetters: Verhalen van mensen en gebouwen in Coronie*, by Fineke van der Veen, Dick ter Steege & Chandra van Binnendijk (Amsterdam: KIT Publishers, 2010, cloth € 24.50), devoted to people and buildings in the lesser-known Suriname district of Coronie; the second section on plantations, architecture and housing, often with obvious influences from the British Caribbean, will be of interest to Caribbeanists in general. In the seven essays that constitute *Oorlogserfgoed overzee: De erfenis van de Tweede Wereldoorlog in Aruba, Curaçao, Indonesië en Suriname* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2010, paper € 24.95) Esther Captain & Guno Jones explore the heritage of World War II, in the form of monuments or remembrances, in the former Dutch colonies. *Paramaribo brasa!*, compiled by Ko van Geemert (Amsterdam: Bas Lubberhuizen, 2010, paper € 22.50) is an entertaining literary walk through Paramaribo that also includes articles by Michiel van Kempen on Suriname literature, Els Moor on the December murders of 1982 as depicted in Surinamese prose, theatre, and poetry, and Patrick Meershoek on his visit with poet Michael Slory. *Migratie en cultureel erfgoed: Verhalen van Javanen in Suriname, Indonesië en Nederland* (Migration and Cultural Heritage: Stories of Javanese in Suriname, Indonesia and the Netherlands – Migrasi dan Warisan Budaya: Cerita cerita orang Jawa di Suriname, Indonesia dan di negeri Belanda), edited by Lisa Djasmadi, Rosemarijn Hoeft & Hariëtte Mingoen (Leiden, the Netherlands:KITLV Press, 2010, cloth € 19.95) presents twelve life stories told by Surinamese Javanese from Indonesia, Suriname, and the Netherlands linking processes of migration, memories, and the formation of cultural heritage, and includes summaries in Bahasa Indonesia and English.
In *Edward Seaga and the Challenges of Modern Jamaica* (Kingston: University of the West Indies Press, 2009, cloth US$ 50.00), based on archives and a slew of interviews, Patrick E. Bryan offers a scholarly, balanced, and engaging political biography of this JLP stalwart who led the nation as prime minister for the whole of the 1980s.

*Versos e cacetes: O jogo do pau na cultura afro-fluminense* (Verses and Cudgels: Stick Playing in the Afro-Brazilian Culture of the Paraíba Valley [Rio de Janeiro, Brazil]), written and directed by Matthias Röhrig Assunçao & Hebe Mattos, is a captivating DVD in Portuguese with English subtitles, featuring interviews and demonstrations of this rural martial art with a number of charming older men talking about (and doing) something they love; it begs comparison not only with its better-known cousin, *capoeira*, but with stick fighting traditions throughout the Caribbean.

*Les traites et les esclavages: Perspectives historiques et contemporaines*, edited by Myriam Cottias, Elisabeth Cunin & António Almeida Mendes (Paris: Karthala, 2010, paper € 32.00) is the first in a new series of Karthala books entitled “Esclavages,” under the direction of Myriam Cottias. Two dozen brief chapters highlight recent Francophone research in this domain and its embeddedness in contemporary French politics. Historically underdeveloped compared to studies in other countries that were marked by slavery and the slave trade, French research is now in a period of growth, and this volume, based on a conference attended by 300 people in 2006, is probably the best single starting point for readers to get a sense of these developments. The introduction as well as many chapters of the book make it clear that, for this new generation of French scholars, current politics (particularly government policies about immigration and national identity) are closely tied to broadening the population’s understandings of the Atlantic slave trade and its legacies.

then returned, reflecting with frankness and insight on both their experiences abroad and the difficulties of readjusting after years away from home.


If you’ve ever been a baseball fan as well as a Caribbeanist, Mark Kurlansky’s *The Eastern Stars: How Baseball Changed the Dominican Town of San Pedro de Macorís* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2010, cloth US$ 25.95) should please and inform. Deftly combining the history of San Pedro (and the D.R.) and its immigrant caneworkers from the Anglophone West Indies, it shows how sugar production and baseball have been intertwined for more than a century. Economics, international relations, and local history are melded into a story that spans U.S. interventions into the D.R., labor migrations across the whole of the Caribbean, the business of sports, American racism, and more. A good read. *The Quality of Home Runs: The Passion, Politics, and Language of Cuban Baseball* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2008, paper US$ 22.95), by Thomas F. Carter, is a less journalistic, more scholarly ethnographic exploration of the interconnections between baseball and identity in Cuba.
Three more on Cuba. **The Long Night of Dark Intent: A Half Century of Cuban Communism** (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2008, cloth US$ 49.95) gathers together a generous selection of a half century of Irving Louis Horowitz’s essays, articles, and speeches about Cuba and Castro. Our reviewer for *Cuba in Revolution: A History Since the Fifties*, by Antoni Kapcia (London: Reaktion Books, 2008, paper £15.95) was sufficiently disappointed that he couldn’t complete his task, telling us that, in his view, the work was not up to the standards of the author’s previous writings and that there are several well-known books that do a better job of covering the period. In **Sustainable Agriculture and Food Security in an Era of Oil Scarcity: Lessons from Cuba** (Sterling VA: Earthscan, 2009, cloth US$ 117.00), agriculture and development expert Julia Wright analyzes the lessons that industrialized countries might glean from Cuba’s experience during the 1990s.


We next list some titles that we have decided not to have reviewed in the journal but which deserve mention for informational purposes. **Global Circuits of Blackness: Interrogating the African Diaspora**, edited by Jean Muteba Rahier, Percy C. Hintzen & Felipe Smith (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2010, paper US$ 30.00); **Color Struck: Essays on Race and Ethnicity in Global Perspective**, edited by Julius O. Adekunle & Hettie V.


And we end with a list of books that will (probably) not be reviewed in *NWIG*, not because of their lack of interest but because of potential reviewers’ silences (lack of response, despite prodding), alluded to in our first paragraph. We tend to give up out of weariness, after trying several reviewers for a book. (If there are interested reviewers out there for any of these titles, please do not hesitate to email us!) This year’s list includes (alphabetized by author):


RICHARD PRICE & SALLY PRICE
Anse Chaudière
97217 Anses d’Arlet
Martinique
<rixsal@gmail.com>

RAQUEL ROMBERG
Department of Anthropology
Temple University
Philadelphia PA 19122, U.S.A.
<rrromberg@temple.edu>

Globalization and the Post-Creole Imagination invites us to move creolization debates beyond the plantation and the ideological constructions of Caribbean national identity, which have generated numerous exclusions and misrecognitions to the meaning of creole culture and citizenship. Asking “Can the idea of creole cultures still hold in an era when there are no plantations?” Michaeline Crichlow seems to answer in the affirmative. But “Should conceptualizations of multinational corporations in post-plantation eras be framed as new types of plantations?” Here, she responds with an uncompromising “No!” since this would erase the historical specificities of systems of exploitation and domination, obscuring the changing relations and subjectivities that they entail (p. 11).

Navigating between these opposing positions, Crichlow proposes a new “dynamized” model of creolization. She draws on current debates on globalization, postcolonialism, and governmentality to define creolization broadly as a “historicized process of selective creation and cultural struggle,” and as a critical site for understanding “the uneven temporalities and spaces that constitute nation-states’ and subjects’ histories” (p. 1) in order to explore how Caribbean creolization finds expression in the postcolonial, neoliberal era (p. 3). In contrast, the discussion on globalization situates this project more within anthropological debates about the global and the local than within the extensive scholarship on Caribbean globalization. Overall, this strategy seems to suggest that “creolization” predates “globalization” and thus is temporally tied to Caribbean colonialism and postcolonialism. While globalization is discussed in relation to neoliberalism and social theory, bracketing the long-term participation and entanglement of the Caribbean in colonial
globalization forces. How else are we to understand the statement, “globalization refurbished and undermined creolization projects” (p. 201)?

Among the many conceptual frameworks proposed in this book, I find those related to spatial metaphors and performative contexts of power to be the most convincing and empirically supported. “Fleeing the plantation” seeks “to capture a sense of an ongoing journey, or crossing, that one sought to make in the pursuit and homing of modern freedoms” (p. xiv). Through the paradoxes of rooting and routing, staying and fleeing, remembering and forgetting, Crichlow seeks to illuminate “the multivalent nature of creolization process itself” (p. xiv) and to promote novel and distinct ways of generating “a perspective on the imagination of Caribbeans and those in the world who, like Caribbeans, find themselves grappling with modern power’s projects” (pp. xiv, xv). Such spatial metaphors and performative contexts are used to examine the “spatial politics of mapping the present,” and “liminal” acts of re-making selves and places through processes of fleeing and homing. Some of the other conceptual frameworks emphasized in the book are “relational poetics”; the “decentering” of culture, nationalism, the global, the local, and modern governmentality; “masking and masquerade”; critical mimesis; the “politics of the cross”; and liminality. In effect, these are used in addressing forms of creolization that “challenge, play with, appropriate and subvert the older localized creole givens, by ‘detour, evasion, mimicry, by subverting the cultural forms from below, by appropriation, translation, and expropriation” (p. 213).

Chapters 1 and 2 address theoretical and methodological issues, focusing on creolization processes beyond the plantation and the dynamic processes of making place and the creation of spaces for the expression of particular forms of agency. Chapter 3 discusses how economic, social, cultural, and political forms of resistance intertwine in ethnohistorical examples, such as St. Lucia’s sharecropping system, styles of dress and fashion, and flower festivals. The performance of postcolonial Creole imaginations is the subject of Chapter 4, which explores the parodic performance of Lucians, an urban, middle-class youth group in St. Lucia that draws on parodic devices developed elsewhere in the Americas to critique state postdevelopmental projects and elite knowledge. Chapter 5 centers on transnational forms of making place and examines the routes and experiences of a couple of rural Creole St. Lucians who first migrated to England and then returned to St. Lucia. Chapter 6 builds on a vignette about an informal horticulturalist and caretaker of a small green section of a PNP inner-city constituency to illustrate how individual cosmopolitan, “chaotic,” and fluid consumption practices provide individuals with a sense of personal sovereignty in making place.

Although it raises questions both thought-provoking and challenging, there are aspects of *Globalization and the Post-Creole Imagination* (some more important than others) that make the reading confusing and the argument problematic. On the front and back jacket, Micheline Crichlow appears
as the author, but Patricia Northover is listed on the title page and in the preface as a co-author. Concepts and dichotomies – respectability/reputation; liminality, limboing (in reference to the idea of between and betwixt, and to limbo dancing); carnivalesque, masking and masquerade, critical mimesis – are used descriptively, with no mention of their potentially problematic role as gate-keeping concepts in Caribbean studies (Trouillot 1992). In addition, although differences within the Caribbean are mentioned, generalized statements based on empirical cases from St. Lucia are then made for the Caribbean as a whole. Similarly, readers may well wonder whose struggles, citizenship, and subjectivity lie behind expressions such as “Creole nation-state’s struggle” (p. 116), “Creole citizenship” (p. 131), and “Creole subjects.” Are they Cuban, Puerto Rican, Trinidadian, Jamaican, or St. Lucian? Shouldn’t a new model of creolization take into consideration the historical specificities of “creole” and “criollo,” as well as creolization processes and the various theories that they informed (Stewart 2007)?

The book suffers from a writing style that is unnecessarily wordy and cumbersome, particularly in the overuse of neologisms and the breaking and hyphenating of whole words. Initially used by philosophers, literary critics, and artists in the last three or four decades as performatives, as critical moves of *différance*, these writing tactics have ceased, in my view, to have a revelatory deconstructive effect. Rather than evoke or clarify, they act as smoke screens that end up obfuscating the important, timely questions posed by this book. I am afraid that these latter reservations might be seen as doing injustice to the scholarly and interdisciplinary scope of this project. As a social scientist, however, I expect the theoretical sophistication of an oeuvre to be matched by the analytical import of the evidence, and theoretical discussions to be grounded in empirical evidence. For readers who are less concerned with these shortcomings, *Globalization and the Post-Creole Imagination* may offer an exciting addition to the literature on creolization and the Caribbean.
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I was well into my research on the Orisha religion in Trinidad before I realized that a close examination of the history of the island, particularly the impact of colonialism on the imported Africans and their religious culture, would be necessary if I were to truly understand this transplanted African religion. In fact, one could argue that the “context of contact” was the most important factor determining the nature and form of this complex, syncretic religion. Nathaniel Samuel Murrell has taken this approach in his authoritative and highly readable Afro-Caribbean Religions and has applied it to virtually all of the major African-derived religions in the Caribbean culture area. For example, he admirably and thoroughly guides readers through the tumultuous and violent colonial period in Haiti that was so influential in the formation of the “hot” or Petwo tradition; the morphing of African ethnic nations into the Catholic-based cabildos in Cuba that played such an important role in the perpetuation of African religious beliefs and practices associated with the Santería tradition on that island; the tenacious, Afrocentric “black resistance” to colonialism in Jamaica that produced a variety of African-derived religious groups and practices, e.g., Myal, Obeah, and Kumina; and the postemancipation immigration of Africans into Trinidad after a relatively short and uneventful period of slavery in that country and their influence on the development of the Orisha religion.

Murrell’s careful attention to history and the context of contact proves invaluable to his analysis of the precise syncretic mechanisms at work in the various religions. These processes ranged from purely reasoned analogy in relatively passive contact contexts, whereby transplanted Africans freely borrowed and incorporated primarily Catholic traits into their own religious traditions, to “forced” borrowing and incorporation, whereby Africans would hide or camouflage their indigenous beliefs and practices behind a facade of Catholicism.

Remarkably, however, the end result of these processes, occurring as they did across the entire Caribbean culture area, is a relatively coherent African religious tradition that is surprisingly faithful to the indigenous African
forms. This becomes apparent in Murrell’s fascinating ethnographic reportage where he draws not only on his own extensive fieldwork in Jamaica, Haiti, Trinidad, and Grenada but also on virtually everything of note that has been written on African-derived religions in the New World (with a bibliography of approximately 400 references). This coherence, for example, is seen in the presence of prominent African gods, including Eshu (Legba, Eleggua, Exu, Elegba), Ogun (Ogou, Oggun), Oshun (Osun, Oschun), and Shango (Xango), in virtually the same form from Cuba to Haiti to Trinidad to Brazil.

On the other hand, however, Murrell is careful to point out the fact that these African-derived religions are “creolized” versions of their indigenous counterparts and necessarily and unavoidably so, given the often hostile and unaccommodating cultural contexts in which transplanted Africans found themselves in the New World. They are not African religions, per se. One never gets the impression that Murrell is making an argument, but his informed and data-based treatment of this sometimes contentious issue is nevertheless subtly effective.

The book consists of five parts. Part One covers the cultural history of the important African ethnic groups that were transported to the New World as slaves and the African religions they brought with them. Part Two explores Vodou, perhaps the oldest Afro-Caribbean religion in the New World. Part Three focuses on the African-derived religions of Cuba with an emphasis on Santería. Part Four, which Murrell refers to as “a special feature of this book,” looks at Candomblé and Umbanda in Brazil and the Orisha religion in Trinidad. And Part Five, the most extensive section of the book, examines the African influenced religious life of Jamaica including the Myal, Kumina, Poco, Convince, and Revival Zion religions. There is also what I would refer to as “bonus” coverage in the book (a discussion of topics that are generally not included in works of this type) on Obéah as it is practiced throughout the Caribbean cultural area, Palo Monte (a Cuban religion that, while being “creolized” and African-derived, possesses no African/Catholic syncretism and traces its origins to central Africa – the western Congo – rather than West Africa as is the case for most of the prominent African-derived religions in the New World), Rastafarianism, and topics of ethnomedical interest.

Murrell should be commended for addressing the ignorance and discrimination that has been directed toward African-derived religious beliefs and practices in the New World. Noteworthy here is his discussion of the “sinister heritage” of Vodou in Haiti which includes his interesting comment that “Voodoo dolls” have their provenience in Europe, not Haiti.

Murrell’s work will, I hope, establish once and for all the religious bona fides of these New World religions. They are not a hodge-podge of this and that thrown together haphazardly or simple “cults” that can be dismissed as having little cultural relevance. Indeed, they are unique religious expressions that deserve to stand on their own. He writes, “These traditions have
their own cosmological reality and ethos that do not fit neatly into theological Weltanschauung and preunderstandings – whether Christian, Jewish, or Muslim” (p. 322).

Afro-Caribbean Religions is a welcome addition to the literature on African-derived religions in the New World and should prove to be an invaluable resource for anyone who has an interest in this area. Encyclopedic and scholarly, it will no doubt become the definitive source on Afro-Caribbean religions.
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Joining the hefty corpus of research on New World African diasporas, Africas of the Americas interrogates the still-resonant legacy of Melville Herskovits. Explicitly challenging what in philosophy and the social sciences is sometimes called verificationist epistemology, it scrutinizes the ways that discursive practices and historical processes articulate, emphasizing Africa’s complex, metaphorical relationship to this hemisphere. Chapter contributors work to disassemble the layers of time and meaning that have congealed into received wisdom and complacent theory about Afro-Atlantic religions. In doing so, however, all that is solid does not dissipate. This volume questions the nature of evidence and the limits of empiricism with detailed explorations of historical, ethnographic, and linguistic case material, rather than, for example, eschewing these as too elusive to be sought. What results is an unresolved, productive tension between an anti-verificationist stance and an emphasis on examples, data, and documentation.

Stephan Palmié’s introduction elaborates the volume’s organizing questions: how instances of religious behavior, “in” or “out” of “Africa,” are “qualified as ‘African,’” what conceptual grounds make possible such predictions and their meanings, and what the implications of such usages are
(p. 4). In calling for reorienting the study of Africa in the Americas from a “foregone conclusion” (p. 32) to an on-going theoretical construction whose premises are transparent, the volume examines the diverse, sometimes contradictory ways that representations of “Africa” and “Africanity” are socially deployed (p. 14). Particularly apt is Palmié’s point that scholarly attention to the meaning of “Africa” and “Africanity” in diaspora has paled in comparison to examination of the category “religion”; i.e., Herskovits’s “African retentions” do not question what constitutes an “Africanism” in the first place (p. 8). As the volume makes clear, “Africa” cannot be an independent variable in the deconstruction of African diasporic religions.

Ten chapters take up different aspects of this mission. Paul Christopher Johnson charts the diverse influences contributing to the identity of Garifuna (Black Caribs) as a diasporic people, in terms of three centuries of their interpretation of religious practice and, more recently, racial identification in the United States. In contrast to other African diasporic religions, Garifuna religion represents both ethnic pride and a “gateway to a global black identity” (p. 72) rather than being a means of ethnic resistance to U.S. racialization. Arguing that Olaudah Equiano’s Narrative represents the journey he took to ultimately see himself as an “African,” James Sidbury analyzes the text’s movement between first and third person, from ethnic to racial identity, from Igbo Israeli of the Old Testament to New Testament African Christian, and from “freedom to slavery to a renewed and greater freedom rooted in religious awakening” (p. 81). And he shows how Equiano’s view of himself as “African” rested in part on his interpretation of Christianity as a universal rather than European religion.

Reinaldo Roman continues this complication of the directionality and significance of knowledge by examining Cuba’s early twentieth-century Spiritist “man-gods,” Juan Manso and Hilario Mustelier. He asks why one was “endorsed as a healer fit for the new century” (p. 108) and the other vilified and jailed. Disputing the idea inherent in the concept of syncretism that it is possible to treat African and European as distinct entities, and proposing that explanations based on racism were only part of the answer, Roman turns to state forms of governmentality and prevailing ideologies about modernity. The dubiousness of distinctions is also taken up by Kristina Wirtz, who examines the “divinatory practices” of scholars and religious practitioners in their etymological search for African “homelands” in religious songs and ritual speech of Cuban Santería.

The co-productions of scholars, practitioners, and other observers in creating the set-pieces of research on Afro-Atlantic religions is the subject of several of the next chapters. Palmié examines abakuá, a male secret society in Western Cuba. A creole institution before arriving in Cuba, abakuá eventually became an “African” phenomenon, exemplifying a reversal of conventional thinking about directionality “in the Afro-Atlantic space-time
continuum” (p. 215). Comparing two contemporary priestesses, Maria and Preta, Brian Brazeal suggests that Africa has little to do with ritual efficacy and good faith among Afro-Brazilian religious practitioners. Rather, such concerns are endogenous, arising from ongoing negotiations between client and adept. Stefania Capone demonstrates the foregrounding and significance of Africa in the “transatlantic dialogue” (p. 258) between Brazilian Africanists and French Brazilianists, focusing on the work of Roger Bastide. In another reversal of conventional thinking, Karen Richman shows that the Vodou we know today is not the authentic African religion of Haitian peasants but innovative ritual practices deriving from early twentieth-century social and economic transformations that flowed from city to countryside. Local elites (including Haitian ethnologists), foreign researchers, and local performers “were creatively involved in mimetic interplay” (p. 317).

_Africas_ ends with a return to language – verbal and ritual imagery. Focusing on _eres_ (African child spirits) in Brazilian Candomblé, Elina Hartikainen investigates why _eres_ are made recognizable to practitioners through derogatory Iberian and Brazilian racial stereotypes concerning “African” speech. She concludes that such representations can mediate different configurations of Africanness and communicate experiences of racial discrimination in Brazil that otherwise are without discursive recourse. J. Lorand Matory asks that we look in more nuanced fashion at images of enslavement in Afro-Atlantic religions, which employ slavery “as a sacred metaphor of proper personhood, personal efficacy, and moral rectitude” (p. 352) rather than simply mirroring North American views of slavery as dehumanization, the antithesis of freedom, and the negation of identity. In Afro-Atlantic religions, he argues, “slavery” and “freedom” are interdependent metaphors reflecting “semantic slipperiness” (p. 378) and local sensibilities rather than being prefigured stations in a teleological trajectory proceeding from one place (or condition) to another.

Best for those familiar with New World diaspora scholarship, _Africas_ nonetheless should be on newcomers’ radar as well. Readers are pushed to think differently about some old, some honorable, but perhaps too comfortable epistemological presumptions.
This hefty and sprawling volume is the fruit of a conference held at Florida International University in 1999. At the time, some participants likened the meeting to the Council of Nicea, the fourth-century ecumenical synod where bishops established a universal Christian orthodoxy. Fortunately or otherwise, the devotees of the Òrìṣà, Orichas, Orixás, Lwa, and Voduns around the Atlantic perimeter have steadfastly resisted the imposition of any kind of universal doctrine. The scholars who study their devotions have proved to be an equally refractive group. This volume illustrates the diversity of their theories, methods, and conclusions.

The introduction proclaims what would seem to be an incontrovertible truth: the religions that began in the societies now called Yorùbá and spread to the Americas with the transatlantic slave trade have become world religions. They deserve to be studied on a par with Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, and other universal traditions. They can no longer be dismissed as illiterate belief systems, traditional religions, or cults.

Some of the essays that follow are openly proselytizing and doctrinaire. They proclaim the superiority of the religion of the Òrìṣà over Christianity and Islam. They urge American adepts to learn the Yorùbá language and achieve orthopraxis by imitating West African models. They yearn for a definitive break with Abrahamic monotheism. They see Òrìṣà devotion as the foundation for a new crosscultural ethics. They glorify the Òrìṣà to whom they are personally devoted.

Others are more conventionally descriptive. They explore methodological possibilities at the junction of archaeology and oral history. They examine the histories implicit in political and religious processions. They show how histories and myths are in fact contested claims to power articulated by different ethnic polities struggling with each other and with their colonizers. They remind us that the Yorùbá do not only practice devotion to the Òrìṣà, but are Muslims and Christians as well. The rites of the Òrìṣà undoubtedly color their Islamic devotions. Their Aládurà Christianity has grown so fer-
vent that today they send missionaries to Europe and the United States, in an ironic inversion of colonial practice.

Still other essays interrogate the notion of globalization and some of its fundamental tropes from the perspective of Òrìṣà devotees on the African continent and in the Caribbean. They ask what the global village might mean to people who actually live in villages. They inquire whether it is possible to subsume phenomena as diverse as Atlantic slave trade and the Marine invasion of Haiti under the single term “globalization,” or whether a new, historically specific vocabulary is required.

Three papers describe the fascinating history and unique ritual practice of the neo-Yorùbá community in North Carolina, the Òyótùnji village. One attempts to understand the history of Òyótùnji in relation to that of Ilé Ifè. Another traces the spiritual biography of its leader, Obá Adefunmi and his troubled relations with the white Cuban adepts of Santería whose teachings he ultimately rejected in the name of African purity. Another examines a new genre of divination consultation tailored to the needs of contemporary African Americans called the orò idilé or roots readings. The author shows how the linguistic praxis, bodily hexis, and self-conscious traditionalism of the babalão diviner become the means by which new beliefs and practices can be incorporated into the religious canon of Ifá.

Another set of papers examine Santería, Ocha, and Lucumí devotions in Cuba, New York, and throughout Latin America. One enjoins us to look beyond the Iyalochas and Babalawos, who are generally considered to be the guardians of the Ocha tradition in the United States, to the scholars and musicians who brought the religion into the public eye – singers, drummers, and teachers who won followers for the Orichas in Harlem, Miami, and beyond. Another author makes the controversial claim that Santería is not a religion, but a syncretism symptomatic of the disintegration of Cuban society.

Brazilian authors describe the practice of Candomblé in Bahia and in São Paulo as well as the Xangó religion in Recife. They see the traditional cult houses as repositories of African knowledge and argue that this knowledge is threatened by the gradual decline in devotees’ command of the Yorùbá language. One traces the decline of the Axéxé mortuary ritual in São Paulo. Another highlights the difficulty of preserving Yorùbá songs when the literal meanings of the words are unknown to the singers.

George Brandon and Joseph Murphy challenge conventional notions of orality and the transmission of ritual knowledge through initiation. They show how literacy has been a claim to ritual power in West Africa for most of a millennium. Pamphlets and manuals have been central to Santería from the first decades of the nineteenth century, and the current explosion of internet sites relating to the Òrìṣà in their many guises represents a logical continuation of devotees’ traditional appropriation of the means of mass communica-

Two final papers examine the vexed questions of gender and sexuality in Òrìṣà devotion in Africa and the Americas. J. Lorand Matory presents his withering response to Oyewumi’s equally trenchant critique of his work. He claims that there is gender in Yorùbá society and in the Yorùbá lexicon and that attempts to deny its existence are misguided and politically reactionary. Rita Segato attempts a synthesis of their opposed viewpoints. She shows how ritual crossdressing and homosexuality in religious communities present a carnivalesque critique of gender relations in patriarchal Brazil with a transformative potential. Oyewumi’s own contribution is noticeably absent.

A tome of this size, bringing together studies by twenty-eight authors from four continents, around a set of contentious religious issues can only do justice to its subject matter by presenting a set of diverse and often conflicting viewpoints. What emerges is not a Nicene Creed but a portrait of a fractious, global, and growing religious tradition. Its leaders struggle for legitimacy, authenticity, and the authority to tell their history in ways that will help them reproduce their ritual communities. This book will be of interest to those immersed in these debates, but no reader should expect to agree with everything they find in its pages.
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Too much of the ethnographic work on Cuban religion has been Havana-based and Santería-centered, and so it is refreshing to see a study focus on Afro-Cuban religious “reglas” beyond Regla de Ocha, as practiced in Santiago de Cuba and surrounding smaller towns of eastern Cuba, the “Oriente” of this book’s title.

The book’s organization loosely follows the title, with Part 1 focusing on the concept of sacred spaces and Parts 2 and 3 focusing on four particular Afro-Cuban religious practices. Although Dodson emphasizes commonalities uniting all of these practices within an “Africa-based cosmic orientation,” she
nonetheless follows what has become standard practice in books on Afro-Cuban religion, dedicating a chapter to each particular tradition. While she goes further than most authors in historicizing each one and showing their interconnections, the formula is stale and runs the risk of reifying each as an “African tradition” (in Espiritismo’s case, covertly so) and focusing undue attention on questions of taxonomy, instead of showing the mutual co-construction of these “traditions” in the past and present (and the role of folklorists and ethnographers in delineating what the traditions are), when many of the practices are in fact combined and juxtaposed in significant ways.

Moreover, her concern with excavating the deep origins of each tradition sometimes gets in the way, as with her claim that Vodú practiced in Cuba’s Oriente region derives from late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century slaves from Saint Domingue/Haiti rather than from early twentieth-century Haitian labor migrants, who are not even mentioned. And again, in her discussion of the Kongo origins of the Reglas de Palo practiced in Oriente, she relegates to a single sentence the early twentieth-century transplantation of western Cuban lineages and practices of Palo into eastern Cuba, thereby conflating earlier Kongo-derived practices with contemporary Palo Monte or Palo Mayombe, whereas in fact the ethnographic reality is rather more complex. This also causes problems in her interpretation of a religious tradition she labels “Muertera [sic] Bembé de Sao,” which appears to be a strongly Kongo-influenced set of practices focused on spirits of the dead, or muertos, and which serves as a sort of substrate of folk religiosity over which more recent traditions of Palo, Santería, and Spiritism have been layered. Whether Muertera Bembé de Sao warrants being designated a separate “tradition” is not at all clear from the book’s discussion: the name seems to come from one particular religious practitioner and her community, who have cobbled together more generalized terms for muertos (anyone who works with muertos) and bembé de sao, a widespread type of festive ceremony differentiated from bembés and tambores performed within Santería. The relationship between Dodson’s rendering of this particular group’s self-identification and longer-term, more broadly practiced work with the dead (muertera, as Casa del Caribe researchers call it) is also not clear.

Be that as it may, the three chapters on the traditions of Palo Monte/ Mayombe, Vodú, and Espiritismo, plus the more speculative material on “Muertera Bembé de Sao,” are the heart of the book. Each chapter presents an historical reconstruction of the conditions under which one of these traditions emerged and a summary of its current practice, pulling together diverse Cuban and international scholarly sources much in the mold of George Brandon’s well-known study, Santería from Africa to the New World.

Another disappointment is that, although the book is based on over a decade of fieldwork, it is not well-grounded in ethnographic description. One gets occasional glimpses of the rich experiences of fieldwork underlying the
claims, but the account sticks to broad generalities rather than providing specifics of particular ceremonies, practitioner biographies, practices, and religious communities. Only the briefest vignettes and short phrases from interviews appear – usually not enough to back up the broad, normative claims made about what people believe and how they worship. In any event, I had to fall back on my own experience in Cuba and familiarity with the literature cited to evaluate her claims, rather than being provided with evidence in support of her assertions.

Moreover, the theoretical apparatus of the book is thin, relying heavily upon Fernando Ortiz’s concept of transculturation as a psychocultural process that permitted “survivals” of a general African worldview. Nor do Dodson’s major points about sacred spaces go beyond the obvious: that sacred spaces are used to set temporal, spatial, and social boundaries, for communication with the spirits, for communality, as vehicles of historical memory, and to express creativity. More detailed ethnographic grounding, instead of generalities, would have greatly enriched the theme of sacred spaces, both in the chapter dedicated to “what sacred spaces do” and in the chapters on individual traditions.

The book is unusual in the mode of research that produced it: although a single-authored monograph, it reflects Dodson’s collaborative approach to field research, in which she and a team of her students worked together to do participant observation and interviews and partnered quite closely with Cuban researchers of the Casa del Caribe’s Popular Religions Research Team, and in particular with well-known researcher José Millet. It is disappointing, then, that there was not more reflexive discussion about how this model of research shaped the data and experiences of fieldwork. Moreover, and far more troubling, José Millet has accused Dodson of intellectual theft because she removed him from co-authorship and failed to acknowledge contributions by other Cuban researchers.1 As evidence, he has provided what appears to be a very similar book manuscript accepted for publication at the University of Florida Press and listing Dodson and Millet as co-authors.2

One additional criticism I regret to make is that this book would have benefited from much more rigorous copy-editing, as errors in Spanish and English were distracting and syntax was occasionally stretched to its limits. Specialists on African diasporic religion looking to expand their understanding beyond Havana and Santería should be cautious in using this overview of Afro-Cuban religion in eastern Cuba.

The migration of some 142,000 Chinese indentured workers to Cuba between 1847 and 1874 is generally acknowledged to be one of the most disgraceful chapters in the history of modern labor migration. The institution of indenture, with its hybrid mix of “voluntary” contractual obligations enforceable by criminal penalties (fines and imprisonment), was originally designed by the British to find a legally (and politically) acceptable alternative to slavery in a post-emancipation but still labor-scarce plantation environment, principally the West Indian sugar plantations. Unlike its seventeenth-century precursor, which was used mainly for the purpose of acquiring a European labor force for the early American settlement colonies, nineteenth-century Asian indenture was surrounded by immigration laws, regulations, and procedures technically enforceable by a court system, all designed to ensure that tropical labor recruitment and governance did not relapse into the authoritarian relations of slavery.

Discussion on the success or failure of any indenture experiment usually revolves around the degree to which the letter of the law and the practice of labor relations on the ground diverged from each other. However, in the special case of Chinese migration to Cuba (and to other Latin American destinations, like Peru and Central America), the stark reality was that for almost thirty years, there was no relation whatsoever between the language of the law and the actuality of the indenture experience, and the tyrannical hold of the slave tradition was strong enough to override all legal verbiage and replicate itself with great force upon the hapless Chinese workforce. (Indeed, on the island of Cuba, indenture did not follow slavery but actually coexisted with it, and
even came to an end twelve years before slavery itself did, in 1886.) Even the Spanish laws themselves were often ambivalent on the coolies’ rights, unlike other colonial jurisdictions that were involved in indenture (p. 86).

In 1873, prompted by the persistent call from many quarters to do something about the abuses of the “coolie trade” to Latin America, the Chinese imperial government dispatched a three-man delegation (along with a team of translators and scribes) to Cuba to investigate the conditions of labor of the Chinese, and to hear from the laborers themselves about their own experiences within that system. Two of the commissioners accompanying the Qing official, Chen Lanbin, were actually China-based Western officials, one British, one French. The Commissioners heard 1,176 oral testimonies and received 85 petitions with 1,665 signatures over an eight-week period (March 17 to May 8, 1873). The Commission Report summarized their findings in 1876. It revealed the full horror of the “coolie trade,” and the exercise contributed to the ban on coolie migration to Latin America from Macao, where almost all of the Latin America-bound migration originated.1

The complete body of testimonies collected by the Commissioners remains housed in the Library of Ancient Books at the National Library of China in Beijing, and to date it seems that even Chinese researchers have utilized only edited collections of the full testimonies, besides the Commission Report itself. An English-language version of the Commission Report was recently (1993) republished by Johns Hopkins University Press with an introduction by Denise Helly, author of *Idéologie et ethnicité: Les Chinois Macao à Cuba* (1979). The report itself made selective use of the testimonies, which were referenced under a list of pointed questions probing the workings of the indenture system in Cuba. Yun’s current research is conceived as a two-stage project. *The Coolie Speaks* is the first, providing commentary and analysis based on the fullness of the actual testimonies. The second will be a translation of the entire body of testimonies.2 *The Coolie Speaks*, not written specifically for historians, is essentially a learned interdisciplinary meditation on the text of the testimonies themselves, probing the existential roots of the indenture system as it were, and the complex states of mind of the coolies, as revealed in the testimonies’ style and substance. Yun is a professor of English and Asian American Studies, and her discussion inevitably reflects that training in her approach to the historical documents before her. After an insightful discussion of the historical context, she embarks on “a new mapping of the coolie narrative.” As she herself explains,

1. A treaty to end the coolie traffic was not signed until November 1877. It was ratified in December 1878.
2. One puzzling aspect of this story is that the commission itself referred to English translations in their report, namely, “1,176 depositions have been collected, and 85 petitions, supported by 1,665 signatures, have been received, of which copies and (English) translations are appended” (Helly 1993:34).
The reading of this material was, in the deepest sense, a “literary” reading, with an acute awareness of the opaqueness, thickness, and slipperiness of narration. The “details” were overwhelming, yet eventually emerged as pronounced and pivotal in reading the politics as not only an individual protest but also as part of a web of relations and cultural locations. (p. 239)

Not unlike the Commission Report itself, she has had to make her own selection from the testimonies, and while she has not managed to uncover any storyline fundamentally different from that told by the Commission, her reading has uncovered a number of startling facts about the migrants themselves. That the majority of them arrived in Cuba not by any voluntary process, but via violent coercion and deception in or near Macao, contrary to the written laws of recruitment and service stipulated by legislation, is not a new discovery. That they were uniformly subjected to an unending cycle of brutal regimentation and cruelty, during (and well after) their formal terms of indenture, in complete violation of the letter of the law, which was in fact ignored by all – planters and their subordinates, the police, the judiciary, and the government – is also not new. This much the Commission Report described in graphic and horrific detail. The two most revealing facts Yun has unearthed about the Chinese coolies in Cuba concern their diverse provincial origins and their diverse educational backgrounds. The long reach of the forcible recruitment in and near Macao seems to have ensnared individuals from all of China’s provinces, not just Cantonese.

Eighty-nine per cent of the testifiers were from Guangdong, but their testimonies nevertheless indicated coolies originating from at least fourteen provinces of China, including inland provinces and some near Mongolia, in descending order: Guangdong, Fujian, Hunan, Jiangxi, Zhejiang, Guangxi, Jiangsu, Jiangnan, Anhui, Sichuan, Tianjin, Henan, Hebei, and Shanxi. The testimonies also reveal that the coolie population included Vietnamese, Filipinos, and Manchu bannermen, who were a highly privileged ethnic group in China. (p. 70)

Moreover, the surprising literary quality of many of the written petitions also revealed that numerous coolies had received educational training at the lower levels of provincial achievement, which gives added poignancy to the charges of kidnapping leveled against the recruiters in and near Macao.

3. One hapless coolie had even lived in California before sailing to Cuba out of a misguided sense of adventure, and was forced into bondage after arrival (p. 144).

4. Such as Petition No. 20, discussed on pages 137-42, and reproduced in the appendix. Thirty-four percent of the petitions were signed by ten or more coolies, and 12 percent were signed by groups of 80 or more (p. 77). Petition 20 was the largest, signed by 164 people.
The testimonies reveal coolie labor to be drawn from widely diverse professional fields, including academia, medical practice, civil service, and business. (pp. 65-66)

One petition was written by four people who revealed that they had been military officers in Guangdong (p. 75).

Yun also calls attention to a weakness of the commission report, which made no mention of women, but of whom the testimonies and other sources presented clear-cut evidence.

While there is scant evidence of their presence in the testimonies, the depositions and petitions reveal one case of their signatures appearing together on a mass petition (Petition 15), with their gender indicated by Chinese traditions of naming for unmarried and married women. Occasionally, testifiers made mention of Chinese women headed for bondage, such as a former bricklayer He Asi who mentioned travelling with 12 women during the passage (Deposition 376). While not mentioned in the testimonies, advertisements in Cuban newspapers also revealed the sale of Chinese girls and women. One such advertisement indicated the sale of a “Chinese woman of twenty-one years” and the other announced the sale of a “Chinese girl.”

Glimpses of the traffic in Chinese girls emerge in episodes documented by Persia Campbell, Juan Perez de la Riva, and Juan Jiménez Pastrana. Campbell noted the discovery of 44 young Chinese girls imprisoned under deck of the British ship Inglewood bound for Cuba … Perez de la Riva noted that in Cuba, José Suarez Argudin, a well known Spanish Cuban slaver, was known to keep Chinese girls. And Jiménez documented the open sale of Chinese in Cuban newspapers, including girls … Even before the advent of mass coolie labor to Cuba, there is evidence of Chinese girls being sold in the Cuban market. In the main newspaper, Diario de la Habana, nine days prior to the first coolie ship arrival (the Oquendo), one ad read as follows: “For sale: a Chinese girl with two daughters, one of 12-13 years and the other of 5-6, useful for whatever you may desire.” (pp. 63-64)

A similar omission in the report was that of Chinese who had escaped and joined the rebel cause in eastern Oriente province, although it acknowledged the difficulty of ascertaining how many chinos cimarrones and mambises, if any, were among the insurgent forces (p. 62).

It is difficult to capture in this short review the many strengths of Yun’s perceptive discussion of this migration. But I would also like to point out what seemed to me to be two weaknesses of the book. First, not all the testimonials cited in the discussion were included in the appendix, when several might easily have been. Secondly, while there is some comparative reference to other forms of indenture practiced in the West Indies, there is no attempt
to probe the cultural implications of the uniformity of treatment meted out to the Chinese in all the Latin countries (especially, but not solely, in Peru). This contemptuous treatment came not only from the planter class and their subordinates (often black) but also from the general citizenry. For example, “here, whites and blacks often bully the Chinese; they hit us without any reason and throw stones at us” (p. 121); or again, “People in Cuba already got used to enslaving the blacks but they treat Chinese worse than black slaves. This does not make any sense.” (p. 122).

These small criticisms aside, it is clear that Lisa Yun’s learned discussion of the suppressed history of the Chinese in nineteenth-century Cuba, bringing to the surface their own views on the indenture experience, will become as standard a reference work on this subject as the Report of 1876 itself was in its own time. We look forward to the promised translations of the complete body of testimonies.
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The single greatest virtue of this book is that it is not about Fidel or Raúl Castro. After fifty years of revolution, there has to be more than just biography and this useful book gives us plenty of reasons why. That said, Artaraz also illustrates just how difficult it is to go beyond biography. It is arguably this difficulty which accounts for the fact that the author has provided us with not one but three distinct books. The first attempts to trace how Western intellectuals responded to the Cuban Revolution. The second involves quite self-contained case studies of the ideological contents and intellectual struc-
tures of the New Left in the United States, France, and Great Britain. The third involves a discussion and query of who exactly these intellectuals were: were they mere “activists” or individuals truly dedicated to the socialist intellectual enterprise. Artaraz deals with each of these topics competently – sometimes even brilliantly. Never, however, does his analysis confirm what might be the unstated goal of the book: demonstrating a relationship (call it quasi-symbiotic) of active interactions and links between the New Left and the Cuban Revolution. Three explanations for this absence can be derived from the well-documented narrative.

First, individual national expressions of the New Left were engendered and driven “by the particular conditions and political culture of each society” (p. 5). Secondly, and closely related to the first point, was that even as the Cuban Revolution seemed to rationalize itself in ways that appealed to certain sectors of the New Left, the New Left’s understanding of the Cuban sociopolitical reality “was very slight and showed strong hegemonic tendencies” (p. 11). Finally, Cuba was itself driven by its own urgent national needs rather than by some romanticized socialist internationalism. Artaraz describes this Cuban urgency through several telling examples, but one in particular has relevance to the situation in Cuba today: the issue of race in the United States. Cuba, he says, was only interested in how it could use the Black Liberation movement in the United States for its own purposes. “As such, ‘race’ was seen more as a category that could include an extension of the Cuban Revolution’s foreign support than an element that demanded attention in Cuba itself” (p. 180). So much for convictions and consistency. And, yet, one can fully understand, perhaps even sympathize with, the Cuban position, given the isolation caused by the U.S. embargo and the continual threats to the very existence of the Revolution. Cuba naturally sought to identify with any movement that provided material or even symbolic support for its legitimacy as a country seeking its own path of development. This need, more often than not, compelled selective, opportunistic, and short-lived alliances. One might be less charitable with the attitudes of many of the multiple New Lefts in the United States, Great Britain, and France. As already noted, their concerns and preoccupations had their origins in, and in turn responded to, their distinct domestic crises and preoccupations. Their enthusiasm was based on their own self-generated images of the Cuban Revolution and used these often self-deluding, “romantic” projections for their own domestic purposes (see p. 68). In other words, there was much domestic political positioning, national geopolitics, and raisons d’État and little authentic ideological fraternity.

Beyond the three “books” mentioned, Artaraz also makes an important and original contribution in his analysis of the reasons why these various New Left movements slowly soured on the Cuban Revolution. Repeated purges (or voluntary defections) of many original intellectuals took their toll very early on. First came the closing in 1961 of Lunes de Revolución, and this was followed
by Fidel Castro’s *Palabras a los intelectuales*, a dictum that distinguished between an intellectual stance “within” and one “outside” (i.e. against) the Revolution. As Artaraz correctly notes, this placed the power to judge intellectuals and artists “in political hands, not in artistic or intellectual ones” (p. 37).

But it was in 1968 that events brought about a major tipping point in New Left-Cuban relations. First, collective dismay and disappointment: Fidel Castro’s failure to condemn the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. Was sovereignty a purely bourgeois principle? Then followed the political elite’s vehement protests over the awarding of the prize in poetry to the non-conformist Heberto Padilla. After being persecuted for a full year, Padilla was eventually arrested in 1971 and forced to retract his “anti-revolutionary” views in public. This is where Artaraz’s description of the Leninist “model” of the proper role of the revolutionary intellectual comes in very handy. Certainly, many of the New Left continued their association with the Revolution, but the spark and glow were gone. “[The] Cuban Revolution and the New Left,” he says, “appeared to recover a rather orthodox discourse at the expense of the spontaneity and voluntarism typical of the New Left until then” (p. 77).

It is precisely because Artaraz had done his analysis with admirable detachment that one is, frankly, startled by his conclusions. Contemporary Cuba, he argues, once again presents “an alternative model of societal development” (p. 185). Alas, the best he can do to support this conclusion is to cite the cases of the Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (EZLN) in Yucatan, Mexico and the Venezuela-engineered and petro-dollars driven Alternativa Bolivariana de las Américas (ALBA). If these two cases represent the “new dawn” mentioned in the conclusion, then we have learned nothing from the past fifty years and Artaraz has written a good book for naught.
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**Inside El Barrio: A Bottom-Up View of Neighborhood Life in Castro’s Cuba.**
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*Inside El Barrio* is one of quite a few recent books and articles dealing with the so-called Special Period in Cuba, which began in 1990. After the fall
of the Berlin Wall and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, Cuba lost its main trading partners almost overnight and fell into a severe economic crisis. This book is written from the perspective of an African-American historian and urban planner. Henry Louis Taylor, Jr visited Cuba many times between 1999 and 2006, both as a teacher and as a researcher. Together with Cuban research assistants, he has done interviews and a survey as well as participant observation in different neighborhoods in Havana.

Two main themes run through the book. The first deals with the ideological origins of the present Cuban government. Taylor describes Cuban society before the Revolution in 1959 as divided into two classes – the elite and the popular classes (clases populares) – and shows that this division has deep historical roots stemming from colonial times. The ideology of the elites was characterized by economic, racial, social, and cultural differentiation, and it dominated the country until 1959. When the “rebels” (Fidel Castro and his men) took over the rule of the country, he argues, they not only followed the ideology of the popular classes based on equality and solidarity in all aspects of society (except maybe gender, something which Taylor does not discuss), but also started implementing and developing these ideas. Everyday life was transformed through mass organizations and what Taylor calls “the pillar of El Barrio” (p. 87) – universal education, free medical care, and efficient disaster management, which build on the ideology of the clases populares but also depend on the centralized structure of the revolutionary government. Taylor also discusses the economic changes that have occurred during the Special Period, mainly the introduction of tourism and private commercial initiatives.

The second theme deals with the neighborhood as a “catalytic place” and the theoretical argument that “a neighborhood’s nature and character ... will either increase or decrease the risk of its residents to various social, economic, cultural, and health issues” (p. 3). Taylor argues that the revolutionary government changed both the physical and the social structure of the neighborhoods in Havana, and indeed also in other parts of the country, in line with the ideology of equality. He describes how a city segregated by class and race was transformed into what he calls a “people centered” city (p. 31). Urban spaces were opened to everyone regardless of class and race, and villas and mansions were expropriated to be used for housing, schools, or day care centers. Cubans became owners or paid very little for their living quarters and mass organizations (principally the neighborhood committees/CDR) stimulated participation in neighborhood maintenance. The state controlled housing and food distribution through an individual rationing card, which made it difficult to move within and between locations in Cuba. This, Taylor argues, froze the pre-revolutionary class and racial structures which meant that working-class neighborhoods stayed racially mixed as they had been before 1959. A side effect of this stability is the existence of loyalty and cooperation between the neighbors who often have lived a long time together. A description of the barrio San Isidro in old Havana, based principally on a
survey made there, is used to illustrate this argument. San Isidro is what Taylor calls a “vulnerable” barrio inhabited by black, white, and mulatto poor but also targeted as one of the barrios in Havana where UNESCO has a restoration project. It is a close-knit community and people have managed, by working together, to make improvements in their barrio, helped along by strong relations to a benevolent state.

This is no doubt an interesting discussion of the contemporary Cuban capital, but it is a pity that, in spite of the title of the book, only a small part is dedicated to an analysis of empirical data from the barrio. Because Taylor has spent so much time in Cuba and must have a keen understanding of barrio life, he could profitably have used more of his interviews, conversations, and observations to describe it. Taylor is cautious when using data from his participant observation, referring to it as “anecdotes.” To me as an anthropologist, this seems both unfortunate and unnecessary. It is also somewhat surprising since he uses the survey results without any critical discussion of the meaning and possible biases of survey data in general or especially in Cuba, where expressing critical views of policies and leadership can be sensitive. In addition, the book’s chapters seem disconnected and there are repetitions. This becomes especially clear in the sharp division between the uncritical presentation of the housing situation, medical care, and above all tourism and the dollar economy in the bulk of the book, and the very critical approach to the same issues in the epilogue. A more balanced discussion of the issues throughout the text would have been useful.

Despite the book’s shortcomings as an entity, the parts about history and the everyday life of people, particularly the household economy, make it well worth reading.


CRISTINA VENEGAS
Department of Film and Media Studies
University of California Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara CA 93106-4010, U.S.A.
<venegas@filmandmedia.ucsb.edu>

The overall turmoil produced in Cuba by the end of economic partnerships with the former Soviet Union meant that Cuban cinema, traditionally sup-
ported and centralized by the state through the Instituto Cubano de Arte e Industria Cinematográfica (ICAIC), has dispersed into many sites and modes of production. Weaving together countless interviews with filmmakers and cultural bureaucrats, film scholar Ann Marie Stock draws an experiential map of contemporary “street filmmaking,” a term used to metaphorically and literally conjure sites of creative activity not represented by the state. And yet, as she and the filmmakers repeatedly assert, the intention of such a move is not to supplant ICAIC as a production entity but to look for opportunities “out in the streets,” beyond national borders, and why not, partnering with ICAIC whenever possible. Stock approaches the topic as observer, participant, and advocate, enunciating her own participation as she actively takes part in the distribution of Cuban films.

Throughout, the book is concerned with how filmmakers coped with and adapted to the transformative social and economic moment begun in the 1990s. Stock examines how institutions provided new incentive and support, and how digital tools factored into an emerging transnational audiovisual praxis. The process of transformation itself is one of the central modes of interrogation as the state responded to the crisis by implementing policies that opened new spaces of civil society through independent economic interactions shifting daily experience and Cuban identity away from centralized authority. Individuals too moved into new spaces of creation and contact with international producers. New modes of Cuban identity emerged at this time and filmmakers in the cities and the countryside explored these psychological and cultural dimensions.

The book opens with three chapters on cultural organizations established in the 1980s and 1990s that paved the way for the modes of production and circulation of “street films.” The first focuses on the Escuela Internacional de Cine y Televisión (EICTV) established in 1986, the Asociación Hermanos Saíz, the Movimiento Nacional de Video, and the Fundación Ludwig de Cuba as important sites of cultural activity that consistently supported the production of video and the visual arts. The second discusses Televisión Serrana, a community media collective in the Sierra Maestra region, and the third covers ICAIC’s Animation Studio. While these institutions differ in scope and longevity, bringing them into the foreground presents new understanding of the interconnections between non-governmental and state institutions as well as insight into the complex exchanges that maintain international linkages.

The book’s second section – Chapters 4, 5, and 6 – is devoted to three filmmakers (Juan Carlos Cremata Malberti, Pavel Giroud, and Esteban Insauti) who established themselves during this period but whose individual characteristics reveal an extensive landscape of professional experience. The final section brings together encounters with several other young filmmakers through the annual Muestra de Nacional de Nuevos Realizadores as well as a meditation on the importance of the Muestra and other smaller film festivals.
on the island for distributing the work of filmmakers. The epilogue returns to a broader framework of the challenges of filmmaking in Cuba, putting ICAIC back into the discussion.

Relying primarily on author interviews, On Location in Cuba makes a valuable contribution to the study of Cuban cinema. “Street filmmaking,” Stock demonstrates, has increasingly redefined the cinema experience as transnational, with new filmmakers building on the formal training they received at film schools from national and international teachers. Their education thus already embodied the international perspective that later constituted their new outlook (pp. 170-71). The interviews underscore that the changes respond to a convergence of economic, technological, and industrial forces. No longer building a cinema of the Revolution, the films look into personal themes and film genres that have not often been promoted through ICAIC’s vision.

While the interviews are enlightening, candid, and entertaining, one wishes that Stock had engaged with them more critically so as to get to a deeper sense of the tensions that define this media landscape. Since one of the book’s arguments is that the experience of the filmmakers has brought them into contact with global forces of filmmaking, the interviews should speak to the interactions with international partners in greater detail so as to reveal what makes them adept at making international contacts as well as the pre-conditions that provide that level of professional access. At international festivals and events, these young Cuban filmmakers compete with young and experienced filmmakers from all over the world; reflecting on those interactions would have enhanced Stock’s argument about the specificity of transnational exchanges. What does it take to be part of world film culture? To say that the filmmakers are skilled at using new technologies (email, the Internet, etc.), while true, glosses over the difficulties involved in negotiating these privileges in Cuba. As has become well known through the Cuban blogosphere, connecting to the Internet in Cuba is at best slow and at worst very frustrating. Between electricity blackouts, equipment breakdowns, slow connection speeds, and other sundry problems, staying connected is no small feat and presents additional disadvantages and obstacles to maintaining an international presence.

The emergence of digital tools for networking and filmmaking in Latin America adds a new dimension in the investigation of the forces of transnational cinematic exchanges. The present study brings together specific personal experiences and institutional histories, teasing out the connections that contribute to the decentralization of filmmaking in Cuba.
Cultural anthropologist Ariana Hernandez-Reguant and the nine other contributors to this book undertake a necessary and welcome reflection on the Special Period in Cuba as an instance of late socialism. Fully aware of discussions surrounding the phenomenon of late socialism as an historical development not unique to Cuba, the ten articles and the introduction engage Cuba’s changing life and representations during the 1990s in an attempt to answer the questions posed by late socialism from a specifically Cuban-centered perspective and experience. This specificity is seen as “a defining category of experience” (p. 1) suggested by the question: “Can we speak … of a Special Period culture?” (p. 3). The partial answers to this broad and crucial question appear here in the form of serious, scholarly essays that offer important insights, valuable information, possible provocations, and a very interesting read.

The volume is the product of a conversation initiated at a conference of the same title organized by Hernandez-Reguant at her home institution, UC San Diego, in 2005. Drawing on the ideas exchanged during that encounter, the book is an invitation to ponder, both epistemologically and through various methodologies, on a number of issues directly impacted by the changes experienced in Cuba and Cuban culture and thought after the fall of the Soviet bloc. The essays examine the impact of these transformations in a number of realms: ideology, political economy, market reforms, social stratification, subjectivity, agency, and citizenship, among others.

The contributors are Cubanologists from different disciplines, practices, and provenances: anthropologists, ethnomusicologists, literary and cultural critics, film, media, and art scholars from Cuba and abroad. All had first-hand experience of life in Cuba during the 1990s and are current on debates about Cuba. The topics studied range from literature and religious practices to music, film, and art. In a wide-ranging discussion that bridges the humanities and the social sciences by considering emerging environments and representations within a political economy infused with human agency, the essays integrate textual and aesthetic analysis with studies of production and consumption of cultural materials. If, as the book reminds us, during
the Special Period Cuba saw “an explosion of forms of popular culture that questioned the canonic divide between ‘high’ and ‘low,’ sharply upheld by socialist cultural policies” (p. 2), then it is only natural that some of the questions posed by these essays include: How can one be Cuban and not be a revolutionary? What does it mean to be cosmopolitan? How does one juxtapose socialist practices and capitalist landscapes? How can one resolve the conflict between individual needs and collective responsibilities?

Divided into three sections – “Foreign Commerce,” “Plural Nation,” and “Transnational Publics” – the book “focuses on the way in which artists, intellectuals, and various expressive communities operated within a temporal framework that was critiqued and selectively represented, yet was accepted as a fact of life” (p. 2). Reflections and critical visions of the changes ushered in by the Special Period as a social experience in Cuba are captured quite effectively in this book. In tune with the new state of affairs: “the essays in this collection show multiple positions and consciousness of self and others based on race, generation, and sexuality, as well as diverse visions of citizenship, labor, property, community, altruism, and profit, [that has] marked a departure from an earlier social pressure to express a uniformity of experience” (p. 3).

Exploring this extraordinarily varied and at times controversial production, Esther Whitfield’s “Writing the Special Period” and Jacqueline Loss’s “Wandering in Russian” discuss works that evidence significant changes in literary texts that no longer follow the expectations set forth by Fidel Castro’s directives to artists in the Second Declaration of Havana in 1962. Kenneth Routon and Kevin M. Delgado study Afro-Cuban religions, their systems of belief, authenticity, cultural authority, and market value as a commodity exchange in the public sphere in well-researched and revealing essays.

Scarcity entails change, as most of the essays remind us. This is nowhere more evident than in the production of films in the period under consideration. Cristina Venegas and Lisa Maya Knauer critically address these changes expressed at times as a search for new meanings and a new relation toward film production, which includes the visual image as a form of audiovisual remittance. Roberto Zurbano addresses music, especially Cuban Rap, as a social and cultural movement that not only expresses material deprivation but also a deterioration and subversion of the utopian vision of Cuba’s revolutionary, emancipatory project. Also discussed is the redefinition of the notion of identities in excellent and nuanced essays by Laurie Frederik, Ariana Hernández-Reguánt, and internationally renowned Cuban artist Antonio Eligio Fernández (“Tonel”). Refreshingly, Cubans living abroad are not excluded from the discussions.

Touted as a multidisciplinary evaluation of the impact of market reforms in Cuba’s cultural policies and practices after the fall of the Soviet bloc, these insightful essays shed light on the changes that Cuba’s opening to global markets of mass culture brought to the cultural field during the so-called
Special Period in Times of Peace. They also remind us that, as the space for public expression has increased in Cuba, so have serious interpolations and dialogues about those changes. This important collection is a valuable contribution to a long overdue and necessary dialogue.
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Union City, New Jersey, has been dubbed Cuba’s “northernmost province” or “Little Santa Clara” because many Cuban exiles from the prerevolutionary province of Las Villas (now Villa Clara) relocated there. Well before the Cuban Revolution, hundreds of working-class families from the small towns of Fomento and Placetas sought employment in Union City’s large manufacturing sector, particularly in the garment industry. After 1959, chain migration led thousands of political refugees to the area, especially during the so-called Freedom Flights between 1965 and 1973.

Most of the exiles were white, middle-class, relatively well-educated, and anti-Communist. By 1970, they had built the second-largest Cuban settlement in the United States (after Miami), in Union City and neighboring West New York. They quickly established numerous small businesses — notably restaurants, cafeterias, grocery stores, bakeries, and furniture stores — along Bergenline Avenue, the main commercial thoroughfare. They also set up civic organizations, social clubs, schools, religious institutions, and newspapers. In 1986, Robert (Bob) Menéndez was elected the first Cuban mayor of Union City. By most measures, the area’s Cuban community has thrived economically and politically.

In 1968, at the age of 21, Yolanda Prieto arrived in Union City with her family from Camagüey, Cuba. At the time, she would have preferred to remain in Cuba and contribute to the dialogue between revolutionaries and Catholics. But her father insisted on keeping the family together and moving abroad. Like many immigrants, she and her parents became fac-
tery workers in Union City. She still remembers that an Italian American coworker ridiculed her foreign accent in English and decried the “Spanish” invasion of the town (p. 40). Prieto first attended night school, later received an educational loan from the Cuban Refugee Program to study full-time, and eventually became a sociologist at Rutgers University. *The Cubans of Union City* chronicles her lifelong experiences as both a participant and researcher of her own community.

The book’s main objective is to analyze the social, economic, political, and religious integration of Cuban immigrants in Union City. Contemporary debates about assimilation and transnationalism inform Prieto’s narrative. Discarding conventional theories of straight-line assimilation, she documents the fact that many Cubans (especially recent arrivals) maintain ties with their relatives on the island through visits, remittances, telephone calls, and email. However, “the main difference between Cubans and other groups is that Cubans cannot participate in their homeland’s political process” (p. 150). An excellent illustration of Cubans’ enduring transnational connections lies in their Catholic faith. Here Prieto highlights the significance of Pope John Paul II’s visit to Cuba in 1998, which she witnessed as part of a pilgrimage organized by the New York archdiocese.

Methodologically, the book draws primarily on unstructured interviews with 102 Cuban Americans in Union City and other New Jersey cities. The interviews, conducted mainly in Spanish between 1999 and 2008, lasted between two and three hours each. The participants included community, religious, business, and political leaders, as well as ordinary Cuban immigrants. Among them were Bob Menéndez, currently a U.S. Senator; Silverio Rodríguez, a militant of the anti-Castro organization Alpha 66; Dionisio Villanueva, a spokesperson for the Hispanic Mercantile Federation; Siomara Sánchez, the president of the Association of Cuban Women of New Jersey; and Lourdes Gil, a poet and Hispanic literature professor. Throughout the book, Prieto interweaves her informants’ testimonies and ethnographic vignettes with analysis of historical trends, census and survey data, and maps.

A fine exemplar of the sociological imagination, Prieto’s account provides a balanced and sympathetic interpretation of the Cuban diaspora, although she does not share all of its dominant ideological tenets. She accomplishes the difficult task of telling the story of Cuban Union City “through the voices of the protagonists, including my own” (p. xi). But her voice never overburdens the narrative, even when she dissects her subjectivity. For instance, she claims that “being Cuban gave me a great advantage in studying this community” (p. xiii), while she grants that “it was difficult for me to ascertain the feelings of other Hispanics toward Cubans precisely because I am Cuban” (p. 94). Although the text is permeated by a self-reflexive tone, it remains a well-grounded ethnography. I especially appreciated her insights on the incorporation of Cuban refugees in Saint Augustine parish, which she joined
after arriving in Union City, as well as her assessment of the impact of the papal visit on Cuban Catholics at home and in the diaspora.

Prieto’s work contributes substantially to broadening academic and public discussions about the Cuban exodus, traditionally centered on Miami’s ethnic enclave. In New Jersey, Cubans tend to be more working class, less educated, more liberal, and more dispersed than in South Florida (p. 28). Most of Union City’s Cuban residents arrived during the second wave of Cuban immigration (1965-1973), which took less affluent persons to the United States. Since the 1990s, many Cubans have moved away from the area, mostly to Miami, Bergen County, and other New Jersey suburbs. Consequently, the city’s Cuban population has waned, while other newcomers have increased their presence, especially Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Colombians, and Salvadorans.

The Cubans of Union City is an incisive case study of contemporary immigration and ethnicity in a changing urban landscape. Prieto ably underlines the historical origins of the Cuban exodus, the development of Cuban businesses and voluntary associations, the labor force participation of Cuban women, the role of the Catholic Church in sustaining a sense of Cuban identity, and the centrality of political exile for that identity. In the end, she shows that U.S. immigration policy promoted Cubans’ swift integration into the host society by providing legal privileges and economic assistance during the cold war. Unfortunately, few other immigrant groups have received such a warm welcome in the United States.

Target Culebra: How 743 Islanders Took On the Entire U.S. Navy and Won.
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<jrb_1947@yahoo.com>

Richard Copaken became a well-known figure in Puerto Rico almost four decades ago when, as a young lawyer, he began participating in the complex legal and political efforts that culminated with the U.S. Navy’s exit from the island of Culebra. He served as attorney for Mayor Ramón Feliciano and
was friend to the then-senate president, Rafael Hernández Colón, who later became the governor of Puerto Rico.

Copaken was one of those Americans whose life became deeply intertwined with Puerto Rico and who was inevitably caught up in a relationship that, as he writes in this book, transcended rational calculation and moved into the realm of feelings and emotions. Before his death in 2008, at the request of the governor of Puerto Rico, he became involved in the legal battle to force the Navy out of Vieques. In Target Culebra, Copaken links the two islands: “At long last, the saga that began for me in Culebra and ended in Vieques thirty-three years later finally was over.”

Copaken’s account mentions numerous people in the United States and Puerto Rico, dates, documents, legislation, meetings, events, and trips with meticulous attention to detail. He provides both a record of events and interpretations of them based on his strong, and sometimes controversial, views on particular incidents.

Copaken’s memoirs about his involvement in the case of Culebra and, in Puerto Rican politics, constitute a valuable document about the steps taken between 1970 and 1975 to end all military practice and bring about the Navy’s exit from the island. But the book may also be read as a broader discussion about unequal power relations exerted at the time by the U.S. Navy in Puerto Rico. The dynamics of power portrayed include the actions of congressional aides, congressmen, law firms, journalists, members of the National Security Council, congressional committees and subcommittees, universities, secretaries of defense and the navy, and presidential aides, among others.

Target Culebra broadens our understanding of the complex civil-military relations in the United States. It is also a text that reads like a political and legal thriller, set in the hallways of power in Washington, in a beautiful Caribbean island besieged by U.S. military bombardment, in la Fortaleza, in London, and on an island close to Anguilla with the suggestive name of Dog Island. Writer Joe Trento is right when he comments on the back cover that “John Grisham is not the only lawyer who can write.”

Copaken’s story has heroes, villains, and people in between. His heroes include Ramón Feliciano (the astute and principled mayor of Culebra), Rafael Hernández Colón, and Luis Muñoz Marín, as well as some minor players such as Luis Negrón López and others on the governor’s staff. His principal villains are Luis A. Ferré and Roberto Sánchez Vilella, with other well-known figures such as Teodoro Moscoso, Alex Maldonado, Jaime Benítez, and José Cabranes in this category as well.

In the end, this hardly nuanced vision of people and events does not detract from the book – a personal memoir, not an “objective” analysis of the
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1. Due to difficulties during the strike at the University of Puerto Rico, it was not possible to provide page numbers for the quotations in this review.
struggle in Culebra. Unavoidably, Copaken underscores the relevance and significance of his own actions, expresses his own interpretation of events, and judges the role of other actors from his own perspective. In the epilogue, he underscores his work as a way of returning something to the nation (the United States) that so generously provided him with education and opportunity, declaring that he had fulfilled not only his dreams and aspirations but those of his parents, honoring their memory.

The history of his family begins in a pogrom in Czarist Russia and then migration to America. Copaken’s involvement in the Culebra case reflected the values with which his parents had raised him. And as a Jew, part of a persecuted minority group, he felt empathy with the situation of Culebrans, an insignificant minority struggling against a mighty opponent.

The book begins by narrating Copaken’s desperate efforts, as a young Harvard-trained lawyer assigned to pro bono work on the case, to stop the U.S. Navy from expropriating a third of the island for air-to-surface missile target practice. It ranges over political agendas of various players, the elections of 1968 and 1972, U.S. Navy interventions in Culebra politics, and more. The Navy’s total disregard for civilian authority is well documented in this book. The Marine Corps tried to subvert Kennedy’s 1961 decision to end their plans to acquire Culebra. There are many instances in which the Navy either ignored or attempted to nullify major decisions taken by Congress, the Department of Defense, or the White House. For Copaken, the case of Culebra “was beginning to look like a window inadvertently opened to reveal a silent military coup by the Admirals that was taking place in the United States without anyone outside the Navy having a clue that this was happening.”

The book also attempts to connect Culebra’s case with the eventual transfer of U.S. military practice to the island of Vieques. Copaken narrates the steps taken to have the Navy conduct their maneuvers in Monito and Desecheo, an alternative which was quickly rejected. Another option for military exercises, Dog Island near Anguilla, also proved unacceptable to the Navy. (Copaken suggests that Navy officers were reluctant to give up golfing on Roosevelt Roads!) Copaken knew of the Navy’s preference for Vieques. He refers to the Popular Democratic Party government platform which promised not to interfere with the military in Vieques. It was up to Hernández Colón to make sure Elliot Richardson, the Undersecretary of Defense, knew the difference between these two islands. Did they trade Culebra for Vieques? Were Puerto Rican leaders aware of the consequences for the people of Vieques that winning the case for Culebra would have? Copaken was aware of these implications and tried to justify it, suggesting that the size of Vieques would lessen the impact. Had he delved deeper into such actions, he might have needed to rethink the role of “hero” in which he casts many of the actors in this story.
The heroic dimensions of the people of Culebra and Vieques who struggled against the military fill the pages of this book. They faced a long battle against a powerful institution that was completely deaf to their pleas and fought to keep its favorite target range in the Caribbean.

Before concluding this review, I would note the recent publication of the memoirs of Ramón Feliciano Encarnación, the mayor of Culebra who engaged Copaken’s services, *La victoria de Monchin: Memoria de la expulsión de la Marina de Culebra* (2009). Now we are fortunate to be able to read the account of two of the main actors in the Culebra saga.
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The last decade has witnessed a remarkable surge of interest in the Haitian Revolution, particularly among Anglophone scholars. Helping to fuel this interest was the bicentennial of Haiti’s independence from France, celebrated in 2004 even as political chaos erupted once again in the troubled nation. The essays collected in *The World of the Haitian Revolution* were first presented at a conference commemorating the bicentennial and hosted by the John Carter Brown Library. A provocative prologue by former Haitian ambassador to the United States Jean Casimir and a useful epilogue by Robin Blackburn bookend the volume’s eighteen essays, which are divided into five chronological sections. Together they provide a rich sample of recent work on colonial and revolutionary Haiti, and on the revolution’s impact in the
broader Atlantic world, in a format both accessible to a wide academic audience and of import and interest to specialists.

Several essays offer fresh perspectives on old questions. John Garrigus and Dominique Rogers, for example, challenge long-held interpretations of the status of the *gens de couleur* (free people of color) in the colonial period. Whereas scholars have traditionally understood segregationist and discriminatory policies toward the *gens de couleur* as a reaction against free colored social mobility, Garrigus locates the origin of such policies in official fears over white creolization instead. Rogers moves in another new direction, providing convincing evidence of the social and economic integration of *gens de couleur* with whites, thereby challenging the traditional narrative in which color prejudice is assumed to have become more rather than less salient in the pre-revolutionary period. Yves Benot’s essay also belongs in this group, disrupting the assumption that independence became an objective of insurgent leaders only late in the revolution. His work, presented at the conference in the year before his death, documents that some leaders conceived of independence as early as 1791, the first year of the slave revolt, and in spite of their royalist rhetoric.

Other essays reflect the field’s recent turn toward political culture and the history of representation. For example, Gene Ogle links white colonial autonomism to the growth of a public sphere in Saint Domingue, one in which free colonists appealed to public opinion in order to challenge royal absolutism. In a fascinating analysis of the gendered meanings of emancipation, Elizabeth Colwill examines the often-ignored practice by which formerly enslaved soldiers of the French Republic could liberate enslaved women and their children through marriage prior to general emancipation. French Republican officials argued that fighting for the republic and becoming husbands would “regenerate” formerly enslaved men into masculine, republican citizens. But revolution and family did not cohere so neatly, as Colwill demonstrates; war brought with it a “profound dislocation in the intimate terrain of women’s lives,” especially for enslaved women whose owners hastily sold them before fleeing the colony.

Laurent Dubois adopts a cultural historical approach in his analysis of revolutionary violence, which, he argues, cannot be studied apart from the “politics of representation” in which it occurred. Contemporary European chroniclers of the Revolution understood well the impact of graphic descriptions of insurgent violence on their readers, while revolutionary leaders considered how the western world would interpret their treatment of whites. Likewise, Ashli White shows that white creole refugees to the United States cited the violence of both French and ex-slave armies in order to explain the origins and success of the revolution. Meanwhile, U.S. whites contrasted the brutality of slavery in Saint Domingue to their own allegedly more humane slave system, thereby justifying the latter.
White’s essay exemplifies one of the strongest themes in the volume: the revolution’s impact outside of Haiti. João José Reis and Flávio dos Santos Gomes demonstrate the fear aroused in Brazilian slaveowners and authorities by the memory of the Haitian Revolution in the early nineteenth century, when “haitianismo” became a generic term to identify unrest by nonwhites. Yet Ada Ferrer’s sharp analysis of Cuba moves beyond the typical assumption that the revolution caused a generic sense of panic among Atlantic world slaveowners and vague inspiration in slaves. Local, specific threats of slave resistance fueled the fear of Cuban planters as much as the memory of the revolution, she argues, and slaves engaged with news of current Haitian events as much as they did accounts of the revolution, finding concrete sources of inspiration in both.

Perhaps most importantly, the volume demonstrates rich opportunities for new research. Jacques de Cauna offers a glimpse of the remains of Saint Domingue’s built environment. Haiti, he notes, is a “living museum” of creole plantation society whose architectural heritage is both understudied and underfunded. Sue Peabody reveals U.S. court records – particularly suits for freedom by enslaved people – to hold a wealth of primary material for historians interested in both the experiences of nonwhite refugees from Saint Domingue and the legal history of the Atlantic world. Several other chapters begin to explore an important yet long-ignored question: the perception and reception of the Haitian Revolution in France. Malick Ghachem and Jeremy Popkin address such concerns in separate articles on revolutionary politics, while Alyssa Sepinwall and Léon-François Hoffman examine the place of the Revolution in nineteenth- and twentieth-century French history and literature.

Readers can come away from this volume reassured that the Haitian Revolution is finally receiving the attention it deserves from scholars across fields and around the globe. However, one is still left with a nagging discomfort provoked by the knowledge that so few Haitian voices are involved in this international conversation, and that the attention tends not to benefit the Haitian people directly. Blackburn briefly addresses these issues, proposing that the international community of scholars commit itself to supporting Haitian efforts at historic preservation, a need made clear by de Cauna’s essay. Given all that Haiti’s past has taught us, it seems the least we can do.
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The journalist Bernard Dieuđôché, best known for Papa Doc: The Truth About Haiti Today, has written a new book chronicling the founding and reporting of his newsweekly, Haiti Sun, during the 1950s. Published in English, Haiti Sun had a limited audience. Dieuđôché’s connections to the foreign (especially American) press gave him, however, significant journalistic influence. Moreover, by covering glamorous social events and the lifestyle of the rich and famous, the Haiti Sun attracted the attention of the elite and expatriate community. The paper did not just highlight frivolities of the well-off; it also featured a column entitled Personality of the Week that recognized “persons, big and small who had made a contribution to the Republic or made news that week” (p. 91). In addition, the Haiti Sun prided itself on defending free speech and being politically independent. This generated the occasional harassment and threat from the government, culminating in the Sun’s forced closure by Papa Doc Duvalier in 1963.

Bon Papa: Haiti’s Golden Years covers mostly the 1950s, the period which was dominated by the presidency of General Paul Magloire and which Dieuđôché describes as a “magical time” (p. 9) in Haiti’s history. The country seemed to be poised to “take off.” It was relatively prosperous and peaceful with the capacity to attract foreign investments, tourism, and celebrities. This is not to say that Haiti’s so-called “golden years” had no major flaws or problems. In fact, Dieuđôché recognizes the great material and cultural chasm between the rural majority and the small well-off urban minority. He acknowledges not only the divisions of color and class that plagued Haitian society, but also the caudillismo of Magloire’s authoritarian rule. These “golden years” therefore had severe limitations, but they compare well to the ensuing five decades of persistent crisis and decay which are in Dieuđôché’s view a story of “man’s inhumanity to man” (p. 10).

Paradoxically, this story of man’s inhumanity to man was rooted in Magloire’s own failings and determination to remain in power illegally for the longue durée. In May 1950 Magloire himself headed a three-member military junta that overthrew then-President Dumarsais Estimé for seeking to keep his position beyond the limits of his term. Magloire suffered the
same fate for similar sins when he was forced into exile in December 1956. As Diederich explains, “It was that old and seemingly endemic malady of Haitian chiefs of state, endeavoring to prolong their sojourn in the National Palace, which had inflamed passions once again” (p. 205). Indeed, historically, Haitian politics has been characterized by the recurring emergence of charismatic leaders with seemingly good intentions who inevitably descend into a personal quest for unlimited power and life-presidencies. Magloire’s excesses were therefore not an exception, but rather the typical follies of Haitian rulers.

Similarly, when Magloire decided that he had to ascend to the presidency he engineered his own election by funding his opposition and maneuvering to run as the candidate of a party that he would ultimately ban! The election of October 1950 constituted “Haiti’s first popular vote for president.” Previously, presidents had been selected by the legislature, but now all adult males were allowed to vote. In reality, the election was in Diederich’s words a “ritual” and the outcome was predetermined. Magloire won unsurprisingly an overwhelming majority, gaining 25,679 votes, with his opponent, Fenelon Alphonse receiving an insignificant 7. While the introduction of universal suffrage for males was a small positive step in democratizing Haitian politics, it did little to shake the privileged power structure. Magloire’s election ultimately depended on the tacit agreement and support of this power structure. As Diederich puts it: “Magloire had the backing of the forces that mattered in Haitian politics: the Army, U.S. embassy, Roman Catholic Church local hierarchy, Haiti’s economic elite, and even Haiti’s neighbor Dictator Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo. However, the majority of Haitians remained spectators of their fate” (p. 33).

In spite of the social and material marginalization of most Haitians, Diederich maintains that the country was not “rife with poverty and other forms of deprivation,” but rather was “alive and vibrant” (p. 28) in 1950. Haiti was full of promise as Magloire’s image as a “Bon Papa” taking care of the poor and feasting with the well-off gave the impression that he could bridge the divide between class and color and bring about social reconciliation. Magloire, however, was the typical presidential monarch whose paternalism ingratiated him with the masses so long as he delivered to them a modicum of welfare. Not surprisingly, they sang:

He gives us jobs and money – oh! oh! oh!
He can stay in the palace as long as he wants! (p. 126)

Once Magloire turned into an authoritarian leader presiding over an increasingly corrupt administration his “love affair” with Haitians ended abruptly. Alienating both the power structure and the average Haitian, Magloire like many of his predecessors and successors was compelled to fly into exile.
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Haitian history was repeating itself, only this time the descent into dictatorship would be more precipitous and devastating than in earlier periods. Magloire’s travails created the conditions for the tyrannical rule of François Duvalier. To this extent Diederich’s chronicling of the Magloire period is full of a nostalgia that belies the increasing social tensions and contradictions that Diederich himself exposes. It is true that there was a veneer of seemingly tranquil times which allowed for the gilded life of the elite, but underneath it all were forces that would exploit these tensions and contradictions to mount a despotic challenge to the existing power structure.

_Bon Papa: Haiti’s Golden Years_ is not an academic book. It is, however, an easy and informative read that describes with Panglossian lenses the Haiti of the 1950s prior to Duvalier’s ascendancy. It is clear that Diederich, who hails from New Zealand, has an abiding love for Haiti’s culture, people, and history. It is unfortunate, however, that the book has neither bibliography nor index.
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Bernard Diederich saw 1959 in a way few others have. As Caribbean foreign correspondent at large, he covered Fidel Castro’s victory over Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista firsthand; as journalist and publisher of the *Haiti Sun* newspaper, he also bore witness to the havoc it caused in Cuba’s closest neighbor. 1959 recounts the events of this “Caribbean Cold War” and the lengths to which Haitian despot François “Papa Doc” Duvalier went to safeguard his power. Diederich supplements this otherwise personal memoir with ample excerpts from the *Haiti Sun*, the country’s first English-language weekly and beneficiary of “more leeway as it was seen as an instrument in the promotion of tourism.” He concludes with a nostalgic sketch of Haiti’s sacred Saut d’Eau (p. 119).

Diederich begins describing the “brewing regional war of political ideologies” launched by the events of 26 July 1953, when Castro and others
attacked the Moncada Barracks in Santiago (p. 13). Carlos Prío Socarrás, the Cuban ex-president turned arms dealer and Castro financier, was providing Duvalier with “terrorism expertise” on the condition that Haiti be a silent partner in the upcoming revolt. But Papa Doc, always the opportunist, had also accepted money from Batista, and “reneged on his promise to Prío,” double-crossing the rebels, who were now in command (pp. 21-22). Eager to save face, Papa Doc took the advice of future ambassador Antonio Rodríguez Echázábel, and released eight fidelistas held for murdering a Haitian tour-boat captain. Diederich accompanied them to Cuba in a Haitian Air Force C-47, along with a token gift of medicine. During his five days in Cuba, Diederich interviewed legendary barbudos Manuel Piñeiro, Camilo Cienfuegos, and the Castro brothers themselves. On return to Haiti, his experiences in Cuba were also the subject of a lengthy “impersonal chat” with Duvalier (p. 36).

“The Castro effect” forced Duvalier to placate the Communist threat until he could make arrangements of his own, ultimately turning him into a dangerously paranoid dictator with unwavering American support (p. 39). Papa Doc’s dirty war overtly began January 9, when the manager of Port-au-Prince’s International Casino vanished amid a scandal that, we learn, was cooked up by Duvalier henchmen Clément Barbot and Herbert “Ti-Barb” Morrison in a bid to commandeer the establishment. Meanwhile, Cuba became a hotbed for anti-Duvalier hopefuls; on February 24, exiled politician Louis Déjoie started incendiary broadcasts on Havana’s Radio Progresso and, together with ex-Col. Pierre Armand, Major Maurepas Auguste, and ex-President Daniel Fignolé, launched the Haitian Revolutionary Front, which, despite the guidance of Che Guevara, would later implode from infighting. And in spite of Duvalier’s growing war of attrition against his own people, which brought famine, particularly to the regions of Jean-rabel and Bombardopolis, U.S. officials threw $6 million into the Haitian budget in March alone – “it was a time when anti-Communist ideology excused many sins” (p. 76). Diederich’s best writing is found in the sections narrating the events before late June, when L’Etat bullied the Haiti Sun into a five-month “forced eclipse,” including the April 7 hijacking of a DC-3, Duvalier’s brush with death on May 24, and the pro-Déjoie coup attempt in Jacmel on June 12 (p. 115).

Diederich took up with foreign media during the hiatus and continued reporting domestic affairs in Haiti, specifically what would be the last invasion effort by Haitian exiles before Papa Doc broke all diplomatic ties with Cuba on August 22. He also covered the saber-rattlings between Rafael Trujillo’s Dominican Republic and Castro’s Cuba, detailing “one of the most incredible geopolitical plot-counterplots in Caribbean history,” the mid-August faux invasion orchestrated by Castro’s frontman William Morgan (p. 159). Escalating tensions between the Catholic Church and Duvalier also came to a head in mid-August, when Papa Doc expelled several prominent priests, namely Etienne Grienenberger and Joseph Marrec, over Communist
allegations. August 18, just days after the outrage, Clément Barbot and the tontons makouts terrorized hundreds of mourners in Port-au-Prince’s cathedral, again alleging a Communist plot: “Such charges worked time and again for Duvalier since Cold War ideology was the main concern of the day in Washington” (pp. 172-73).

Diederich’s political drama then shifts to the social events that took place in Haiti once the Sun returned to print on November 8, including the arrival of notable tourists (an incognito Marlon Brando, French actress Martine Carol, and others) and the U.S. Marine Corps birthday celebration thrown by Col. Robert Heinl. He also recounts economic- and business-related news regarding foreign investments. The book’s closing chapters then move from melodrama – a vivid story about pilgrimages to the Saut d’Eau sprinkled with Diederich’s personal musings about Vodou lwa – to confessional, revealing his romantic tryst with vacationing actress Anne Bancroft and the sticky situation with an old flame that ended it.

Diederich writes with an old-school journalistic savvy that makes the brutal history of the early Duvalier era at least mildly bearable. While Diederich raises the specter of the “Caribbean Cold War,” which is both implied in the subtitle and scattered throughout the book, he tends to focus narrowly on the Haitian side of things. The lack of both reference materials and index is frustrating, and the low-quality, pixilated images are regrettable. Despite these blemishes, 1959 is a recommendable year-in-review for those interested in the details of Duvalier’s megalomania or the false-starts of what could have been, fitting somewhere between Herbert Gold’s travelogue, Best Nightmare on Earth (1991), and the Heinls’s history, Written in Blood (1978).
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When this collection of essays by prominent Dominican scholars was first published in Spanish almost three decades ago, the Dominican Republic was experiencing an exciting period of political democratization spearheaded by the then-center-leftist Dominican Revolutionary Party, voted into government after the twelve years of the Reformist Party’s right-wing regime. Within that context, the book brought to the fore of public discussion what, for the country’s traditional ambience, was a new, less Eurocentric and more multicultural and multiracial view of Dominicanness.

Consisting of seven chapters and a brief commentary, the book discusses important aspects of Dominican cultural identity. Chronologically, it covers the entire span of the formation of Dominican society and culture, including the legacies of the Taíno Amerindians, the Spanish colonizers, and the enslaved Africans, as well as the cultural impact of more recent waves of immigrants into Dominican society: Jews, Chinese, Arabs, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Haitians, Anglo-Caribbeans, and twentieth-century Spaniards. Prior to its publication, most writings about Dominican culture privileged the old-time Hispanocentric, Catholicism-centered, anti-African, anti-black, and anti-Haitian views upheld by the most conservative elements of Dominican society.

Bernardo Vega’s chapter on the Taíno heritage, which opens the book, is a detailed description of the agriculture, foodstuffs, arts and crafts, settlement concentrations, religion, music, and vocabulary of the pre-Columbian Indians that have survived or made their way into contemporary Dominican national culture.

In this chapter – “Commentary” – Dominican anthropologist-archaeologist Marcio Veloz Maggiolo supplements Vega’s analysis, expanding on some aspects of Taíno agriculture, and pointing to the need for studies that try to identify the ways in which elements of this culture, while surviving, evolved with a changing historical context, shifting in their meaning or social application.

For Carlos Dóbal the Spaniards had the largest influence on Dominican culture, permeating also the temperament and the way in which Dominicans
see the world and the things in it. Institutions like the cabildos or town councils were seeds of democracy and the cofradías or religious associations allowed African slaves to preserve their identity and self-realization. Dominicans have also inherited from the Spaniards a system of values that includes positive traits such as the courage and honor of Dominican patriots, and negative ones, like the pessimism found among some prominent Dominican thinkers.

Carlos Esteban Deive warns about the challenges of disaggregating the discrete ethnic heritages from the hybrid mix that makes up Dominican culture. He challenges the paternalistic view that slavery in the Dominican Republic was less brutal and violent than that of other colonies, documenting cases of prejudice in legislation concerning blacks, in marriage practices that emphasized the preference for “purity” or whiteness, and in descriptions of subordination of blacks in their interactions with whites.

Rubén Silié deals with the development of a Dominican creole culture. He examines the coexistence and interactions, especially from the eighteenth century onwards, among the numerically dominant ethnicities and racial groups of Santo Domingo. The isolation the colony experienced, he argues, generated a creole culture dominated by Spanish and African components that is shared and practiced by most Dominicans of all racial ancestries. Yet this creole culture, he observes, shows a lack of identity, or a lack of self-understanding that is fully inclusive and equally appreciative of all of its racial/ethnic components.

José del Castillo describes the impact of immigrants in Dominican society since the second half of the nineteenth century – entrepreneurs and merchants from Cuba, Puerto Rico, the United States, and Western Europe, and technicians, skilled workers, and field-hands coming for the most part from the non-Spanish speaking Caribbean islands and Haiti. They all moved to the country to invest or work in the then-nascent sugarcane industrial production that later became the number one source of income for Dominican society.

Frank Moya Pons offers an overview of the modernization that took place from the early twentieth century on, pointing out both its benefits and detriments for Dominican society. In his view, socioeconomic changes in the country were closely associated with alterations in the international world during the period. Events ranging from the world wars, the realignment of capital, and the U.S. invasion-occupation in 1916-24 to the penetration of global political ideologies, the development of tourism, and the massive emigration process by more than a million Dominicans all transformed collective behavior in the country.

Unfortunately, very few people in the Dominican Republic have taken on the challenges that this book introduced three decades ago, and relatively few writings have been published since then on these topics. This English version, a verbatim translation of the three-decades-old Spanish original, does not offer any update of the authors’ initial contributions. For those interested
in the quasi-neglected field of Dominican cultural studies, though, it is a useful tool, a preliminary road-map of the issues that have been dealt with by Dominican scholars as well as the many that remain to be studied and which have direct or indirect cultural implications, such as the value of the cultural and racial African heritage in everyday contemporary Dominican culture, the different manifestations of resistance emanating from the marginalized cultural groups, attention to social class extraction in the integration of immigrants into Dominican society, or differences between the experience of immigrants in general and that of native Dominicans.
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In Chanting Down the New Jerusalem, Francio Guadeloupe argues that the multiethnic society of St. Martin is characterized by its residents’ strong sense of belonging, which transcends racial, ethnic, religious, class, and national differences. This sense of inclusion is due to the necessity “to remain one happy island” (p. 7) for the development of tourism. The title of the book is borrowed from Mama Pearl, a popular Rasta disc jockey who calls Sint Maarteners to join him “chanting down a New Jerusalem ... [a] world where people belonging to different faiths and ethnicities would be able to live a dignified life” (p. 9). The book argues that radio disc jockeys are instrumental in promoting a sense of unity. They broadcast musical programs that create a politics of belonging by spreading Christianity-based moral values such as solidarity and tolerance toward the Other. To quote DJ Fernando Clarke, calypso and Christianity are “the two vitamin Cs for successful living” (p. 223). Calypso embodies all the contradictions of the tourist “money tie system” which is the only source of income in St. Martin, while Christian rhetoric reminds Sint Maarteners that if they want the system to survive, the need to be tolerant and welcoming toward migrants and newcomers is inescapable.
St. Martin is a decidedly multiethnic society composed mainly of migrants and French and Dutch nationals born outside the island. One hundred nationalities are listed in the French and Dutch censuses. In 1999, the year of the last census of the entire population of the French side, French of metropolitan origin or from Guadeloupe constituted just over 65 percent of the total population, with those said to be originally from Saint Martin estimated at 15 percent of it. In 2001, the Dutch population originally from the Netherlands, the federation of the Netherlands Antilles, or born on Sint Maarten was 50.6 percent. Native-born Sint Maarteners account for 30.5 percent of the population and the foreign-born population on Sint Maarten constitutes nearly 50 percent of its population.

In his analysis of Christianity as a metalanguage used by three disc jockeys to promote unity and inclusion of all residents despite ethnic, age, gender, and class affiliations, Francio Guadeloupe offers a rose-colored understanding of racial relations in St. Martin which is contradicted in many ways by the economic, political, and legal situations of undocumented migrants, who constitute between 40 and 80 percent of the immigrants living on the French side and roughly 50 percent of those on the Dutch side. Since the election of President Sarkozy, French immigration policies have been particularly restrictive to migrants both in the metropole and the overseas departments, and numerous laws have been passed lately by the French parliament to facilitate deportations in the metropolis. Actually these laws and new deportation techniques had been passed and tested out in the 1990s in Saint Martin and French Guiana. Hurricane Luis, which in September 1995 left the island in ruins, presented the French and Dutch states with the opportunity to raze the shanty towns of the island and increase the number of deportations.

One could argue that deportations and precarious legal situations are triggered by governments and do not reflect local people’s attitudes toward migrants. However, if one reads *Chanting Down the New Jerusalem* between the lines, it becomes clear that Sint Maarteners (whether native-born or documented newcomers) are not particularly welcoming to undocumented foreigners. The negative public reaction to DJ Cimarron’s activism in favor of children of undocumented parents resulted in the cancellation of his show after just three broadcasts.

Could not the politics of belonging developed by radio disc jockeys be analyzed as a defense mechanism to deal with the situation of terror in which undocumented workers live? Francio Guadeloupe qualifies the events that led to the touristic development of St. Martin as a “series of fortunate local events” (p. 16), but one could also argue that they are what transformed the “friendly island” of the 1980s into the racial nightmare of the 1990s and subsequent years.

*Chanting Down the New Jerusalem* is an original contribution to the study of Caribbean religions as it provides in-depth analysis of three radio
DJ shows that broadcast an encompassing ecumenical religious Christianity in an effort to cement a demographically diverse society. Above all, it is one of too few anthropological studies of this very small binational multi-ethnic island which, in many respects, challenges anthropological theory in the study of politics of inclusion and politics of exclusion to an extent not reached anywhere else in the Lesser Antilles.
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As suggested by its subtitle, Josette Capriles Goldish’s *Once Jews* qualifies neither as history nor sociology, though it flirts with both. Goldish trains her focus on elite Sephardic Jews of Curaçao and their nineteenth-century migrations to four sites in the Caribbean (St. Thomas, Coro, Santo Domingo, and Barranquilla), weaving in casual interviews with present-day descendants, most of whom are no longer Jews, at least in terms of religious affiliation.

Leisure reading of contemporary Caribbean historical fiction, including a novel by Julia Alvarez, inspired Goldish, a former business and financial consultant, to delve into the genealogy, demography, and what she views as the triumphant past of some of these prominent families. Besides overcoming anti-Semitism and economic adversity, the theme that most preoccupies her is what led to the eventual and almost complete demise of these transplanted Jewish communities through assimilation to broader Caribbean Christian cultures.

The approach of *Once Jews* is pronouncedly filiopietistic, framed by both traditional Jewish values and dated models of historiography. These nineteenth-century Sephardim represent, in Goldish’s words, “the quest for Tikkun Olam” (a rabbinical concept roughly understood as bettering the world, p. xv), while Hannah Piza of St. Thomas, who at one point became the breadwinner of her prodigious family, is described as a “woman of valor” (a reference to Proverbs 31, p. 23). Implicitly, these Sephardim are noteworthy because they represent “history from the top,” financially successful (mostly male) Jews, many of whom left a public imprint on broader civic culture. A number of streets in
down town Santo Domingo, Goldish informs us, are named after Curaça oan Sephardim, “reflecting their contributions to multiple aspects of life” (p. 137). Goldish is in “awe” of Jacob Cortissoz, who “pulled himself up by his bootstraps” in Barranquilla, and of his son Ernesto, “as enterprising and successful as his father,” and among “the beautiful people of Barranquilla at the turn of the century” (pp. 213, 214). This hagiographic narrative holds great appeal for family members and synagogue congregations, but for contemporary scholars Goldish’s rich materials point beyond some of her assumptions.

Throughout, Goldish’s quest for the causes that accelerated or inhibited the assimilation of Caribbean Sephardim dichotomizes the region into Jewish/gentile counterparts, resulting in an almost complete erasure of race and racial identity. This is certainly an inappropriate model for the multi-ethnic Caribbean, where peoples of African origin formed the majority of the general population. This dichotomy also sidelines the slave trade, which made possible many of the “contributions” Goldish highlights. The horrific details of this trade and the institution of slavery, moreover, are completely subsumed in the narrative of Sephardic triumph over adversity. Jacob Senior, alias Captain Philippe Henriques, was “a daring slave trader” (p. 64) between Curaçao and Cartagena who appears among a series of Sephardim praised for exploiting commercial potential in South America. Jeudah Senior of Coro, an owner of coffee and sugar plantations, is described as an “aggressive businessman” with an “enterprising spirit” who tapped into the “exciting ... opportunities” of Coro, becoming “the highest taxpayer in town” (pp. 71, 79). When anti-Semitism drove him and his extended family back to their native Curaçao, they (168 in number) collectively carried away 88 enslaved men, women, and children, but not before contributing “greatly to Coro’s economy” (p. 89). One wonders how Once Jews would have read had Goldish consulted with Afro-Caribbean informants aware of their Sephardic ancestry, as did Curaça oan specialists Eva Abraham-Van der Mark (1993) and Alan Benjamin (2002).

That said, Once Jews does offer some innovative material, particularly the oral interviews she conducted with scions of Curaça oan Sephardim. With fluent reading or speaking knowledge of Spanish, Portuguese, and Papiamentu, and herself a descendant of this diasporic elite, Goldish gained easy and friendly access to her subjects as well as to private and municipal archives. The findings from these interviews consistently point to contemporary Sephardic Jewish identity as ancestral, ethnic, or racial, as opposed to religious. No quote better encapsulates this self-ascription than the exclamation of one Catholic descendant of Curaça oan Sephardim: “Soy católica ... pero soy judía!” (p. 161). Goldish also relates that her Catholic informants in Barranquilla “often attribute their commercial success to their Jewish ancestry” (p. 215). Yet, she resists these fascinating findings and their implications, instead emphasizing synagogue and ritual as barometers of Jewishness and Jewish continuity. One wonders if the racialized sense of Jewishness
is specific to Sephardim, who cultivated an age-old nobility myth tied to both the ancient kingdom of Judah and the Iberian Peninsula (as opposed to Ashkenazic Jews who developed no such self-glorification). Moreover, to what extent is this intense pride an affirmation of the whiteness of Sephardic Jews, and therefore of the informants themselves?

Finally, one senses that Goldish has stumbled upon a goldmine of historical documents unknown and perhaps largely inaccessible to most researchers. These include unpublished genealogies, family histories, and scrapbooks she seems to have obtained from living descendants. (The footnotes – perhaps intentionally – obfuscate the precise whereabouts of some of these documents.) At its best, *Once Jews* is evidence that some of the richest historical and sociological sources for the Jewish Caribbean are in the hands and mouths of its Sephardic descendants. As with Jewish history in general, the challenge for Caribbean Jewish Studies is to demonstrate relevance beyond itself.
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In 1973, the year of Elma Napier’s death, Alec Waugh published his final novel, *The Fatal Gift*, which tells the story of an Englishman unable to leave the island of Dominica, having become entangled in the invisible twine of its beauty. Elma Napier would have recognized the sentiment. When she and
her husband Lennox first saw Dominica in the winter of 1931 “we fell in love at first sight, an infatuation without tangible rhyme or reason, yet no more irrational than any other falling in love” (p. 8). Black and White Sands tells the story of that love affair.

Although now forgotten, Elma Napier was in her day a significant writer and a pioneering political figure. She published two memoirs, a collection of travel writing, and two novels (one of which, A Flying Fish Whispered [1938] has just been re-issued by Peepal Tree Press), and wrote for a number of journals and newspapers, including Bim and The Manchester Guardian. In 1940 she became the first woman to be elected to any British Caribbean legislature, serving as representative for the North Eastern District of Dominica for some eleven years in total. Black and White Sands was written in 1962 but never published. Rescued by the small but invaluable Papillote Press, it now appears in a handsome edition.

Elma Napier is perhaps best seen as belonging to a very particular British generation. She is an almost exact contemporary of Sylvia Townsend Warner, Gerald Brenan, Sacheverel Sitwell, and Naomi Mitchison, as well as of Alec Waugh, all writers who – despite their different social backgrounds – grew up in a world dislocated by the Great War, scattering them to the four corners of the earth. An early marriage had taken Elma from her wealthy Scottish home to an Australian sheep station. In Honolulu she met Lennox Napier. After her divorce, they married in 1924, discovered Dominica on a cruise in 1931, and moved there permanently the following year. They undoubtedly lived a life of privilege, but in choosing to build their house in Calibishie, on the wild northeast coast of the island, they firmly separated themselves from the horizons of the small group of white settlers and colonial officials in Roseau, the capital. When Lennox died in 1940, Elma Napier stayed in their house, Pointe Baptiste, hosting visitors such as Somerset Maugham, Noel Coward, and Patrick Leigh Fermor, who painted a memorable picture of the house and its owner in The Traveller’s Tree: “this house, in its remote and forested mountains, was the result of half a lifetime of active pursuits – literature, politics, family, distant journeys and of a compendious and exhaustive range of interests” (Fermor 1984:106).

The Napiers’ arrival in Dominica coincided with a moment of political unrest: the legislative council had resigned en bloc in a dispute about taxation and the administrator had failed to persuade any of the local worthies to accept nomination. When two finally did, the house of one was burned to the ground. Elma Napier tells this story without names attached, but the property destroyed was Mitcham House at Geneva, owned by the Lockhart family, and which Jean Rhys would celebrate as Coulibri in Wide Sargasso Sea. Lennox made the acquaintance of two of the intransient politicians – one of whom may have been an “outside” relative of Rhys’s – and took up the case with the Colonial Office, giving himself great kudos on the island,
which resulted in him being elected unopposed for the North Eastern district in 1937, a position his wife was asked to take up after his death. Rhys and her husband, Leslie Tilden Smith, had lunch with the Napiers on her one return to Dominica in 1936. A letter of Rhys’s sketches a sharp portrait of Elma: “The Calibishie lady is by way of being literary… (Tomahawk in hand, smile on face)” (Rhys 1985:29). Elma Napier apparently always said she could never remember Rhys’s visit, which is so much classier as a put-down. 

Black and White Sands is a beautifully written memoir: the prose sparkles, the anecdotes are lively, the descriptions capture a natural world of wonderful richness and variety. There is a long account of getting to know Dominica and there are some thoughtful pictures of its social and political worlds in the three decades before West Indian independence. Where Black and White Sands scores above even the best travel books, such as Leigh Fermor’s The Traveller’s Tree or Alec Waugh’s Hot Countries, is that it’s based on the kind of deep knowledge of a place that is only acquired slowly: Elma Napier had lived in Calibishie for thirty years when she sat down to write this book. So the 70-year old Elma Napier looks back on a love affair which once swept her off her feet and which in 1962 was still providing the deep satisfactions – and occasional frustrations – of a long and happy marriage. Few books ever written give a better sense of what Elma Napier calls Dominica’s “mysterious charm” (p. 11), a charm which has continued to entangle many visitors in its sweet embrace.
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The relationship between the abolition of the slave trade and the profitability and long-term viability of West Indian plantations is one of the oldest and most contentious debates in Caribbean historiography. It is not dead yet. The “decline thesis,” most fully articulated by Lowell Ragatz (1928) and Eric Williams (1944), tried to connect the fall of the sugar industry to abolition. Advocates identified several key causes, including the disruptions in trade accompanying the American Revolution, the glutting of the market that came with the acquisition of the ceded islands in 1763, exhausted soils, and an overall unwillingness on the part of planters to adapt. In recent decades, the supposed decline of the sugar industry and its connection to abolition has, in successive studies, been scrutinized and cast aside.1 Recent historiography depicts planters as adaptive and innovative in response to changing market conditions. Scholars now paint a picture of a sugar industry that rebounded after the American Revolution, an industry that would have continued to expand without abolition. Even the oldest and smallest sugar islands, such as Barbados, appear to have been undergoing a renaissance in production at the end of the eighteenth century and the consensus among scholars would now be that the ending of the slave trade destroyed the West Indian economy rather than the other way around.

With his first book West Indian Slavery and British Abolition, 1787-1807, David Beck Ryden resurrects the decline thesis. Ryden sees Williams’s narrative of decline as essentially sound. Yet he also melds the recent scholarly emphasis on planters’ adaptive nature and the productivity gains on sugar plantations with the main tenets of the decline thesis. Unlike Williams and a generation of older scholars, Ryden is careful to observe that nothing inherent in slavery as a system made its decline inevitable. For him, productivity gains helped to enable overproduction. He ultimately attributes the decision to end the slave trade to the glutted sugar market that accompanied planters’ “speculative mania” (p. 18). Given the market collapse that came with the credit and housing bubble in recent years, his argument is timely. Overzealous

sugar production, he maintains, peaked with the high prices of 1790s after
the revolt in St. Domingue. Ryden argues that the planter elite, particularly
Jamaican proprietors, had enough political clout in London to gain mar-
ket protection and ensure high profits in the mid-eighteenth century. Their
diminishing power in the metropole, the rising cost of provisions following
the American Revolution, and the increasing competition from foreign sugar
producers combined with overproduction to weaken both the economy and
the West Indian lobby. Ryden also incorporates the recent historiographical
emphasis on slave agency into his reinterpretation by arguing that the costs
of controlling slaves and the risks in sugar production rose during the age of
abolition as slaves sensed a weakness in their masters’ power and solidarity,
further threatening the sugar industry. All of these factors together, he argues,
made abolition politically and economically expedient.

There are few flaws in this thoroughly researched and detailed book, and
for the most part they amount to ambitious exaggerations or generalizations.
Although Ryden claims to treat the British West Indies as a whole, his evi-
dence is almost exclusively Jamaican. He defends his conflation of Jamaica
with the West Indies by insisting that it was by far the most important of
the sugar islands and that its planters had disproportionate political power.
Unfortunately, his work encourages a tendency in what is still an underde-
veloped historiography to see the sugar industry in the islands as a mono-
lithic entity – overlooking important differences among the islands. Jamaican
planters, for example struggled with the costs of maintaining a sufficient
labor force for their brutal labor regime. In contrast, by the age of abolition,
Barbadian planters had naturally reproducing slave populations. There is also
a tendency in Ryden’s work and throughout much of the debate about the pre-
emancipation West Indian economy to make the sugar industry stand in for the
region’s economy as a whole, overlooking the diversified production of the
late eighteenth-century circum-Caribbean. The West Indies is a fertile zone
and planters who found sugar less viable could and did continue to use forced
labor in other productive agricultural activities, sometimes juggling multiple
cash crops. As a factor in declining profitability, Ryden stresses the rising
costs of plantation provisions that accompanied the disruption of trade with
the mainland colonies, the expansion of the sugar industry, and the increased
competition for resources. Yet Ryden does not sufficiently acknowledge that
along with diversifying their cash crops and producing more refined sugars,
planters could maintain profit margins by growing provisions on their estates.

Overall, this book is a testament to Ryden’s expertise in economic analy-
sis and to his thorough archival research in the United Kingdom, the United
States, and Jamaica. He has done more extensive work with Jamaican crop
accounts than any previous historian, which enables him to offer the most
detailed evidence in the literature on sugar production levels in Jamaica.
Likewise, his careful interpretation of the records of the London Society of
West-India Planters and Merchants allow him to make new contributions to
our understanding of the power of the West Indian interest in the metropole and the extent to which Jamaicans dominated that political lobby. The appendix offers specialists a wealth of important new data and estimates, drawn from Jamaican records, on sugar container sizes and prices and on population statistics for slaves. Ryden has made the strongest case for the decline thesis in decades, reawakening a debate that most had thought had been put to rest.
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Melanie Newton has written an impressive work that seeks to unravel the changing roles of free people of color in Barbados from about 1790 to 1860, a period that includes the transition from slavery to emancipation in the British
Caribbean. At the heart of the book she tries to chart the changing political consciousness of free people of color in Barbados during a tumultuous time. What impact did the abolition of slavery have on the expectations and experiences of free people of color? How did amelioration and emancipation affect their interactions with former slaves, with whites, and with each other? Newton reexamines the free people of color in the age of emancipation, earlier explored by Jerome Handler in *The Unappropriated People* (1974). She asserts that free people of color “were an integral part of the social structure, and crucially shaped conceptions of freedom and slavery in the island. Their presence challenged the planter-state’s efforts to clearly delineate boundaries between free and slave and white and nonwhite” (p. 6).

Part One of this well-researched book, which draws on rich primary material, covers the period from the revolutionary 1790s to the beginning of the apprenticeship period in 1834. Part Two focuses on the four years of the apprenticeship experiment until “full freedom” in 1838. Part Three advances into the postemancipation era, looking at the limits of freedom. Finally, an Epilogue makes links between history and the present in a section entitled “The Living Past.” Newton encourages readers to think about how histories of slavery and emancipation are used in the contemporary Caribbean.

In the early chapters of the book we learn a lot about the slave state in Barbados, where, atypically, poor whites (many female) were a significant proportion of the relatively large, white community. Manumission was difficult and expensive. Although the free colored population grew in Barbados after 1780, their numbers were relatively low, when compared to other islands. Even in 1833, there were twice as many whites (14,592) as free people of color (6,584), with 82,807 enslaved people. Some free Afro-Barbadians owned slaves (usually small numbers), and frequently hired them out, as many whites did, to make a living. Many free people of color had relatives who were slaves or former slaves. Free people of color do not appear to have freed slaves any more than whites.

Newton identifies the emergence of two groups of free people of color in the early nineteenth century – bourgeois/elitist and populist/working class. Members of the elitist, property-owning group were pro-slavery at first. They presented themselves as the voice for all free people of color, and pushed for civil rights (such as the right to testify in court) based on their free status. But, between 1816 (Barbados slave revolt) and 1824 (the first year of amelioration), new voices emerged that were not pro-slavery. We begin to see divisions within the free Afro-Barbadian community – divisions along class, education, age, and culture lines. Newton discusses two petitions of 1823-24, symbolic of this split. The first, from the elitists headed by Jacob Belgrave, denounced British abolitionism and was addressed to the legislature. The second, led by Samuel Collymore and written to the governor, represented free colored people of lower-class background. Signed by 373
free Afro-Barbadians, it was neutral on slavery. The legislature viewed this counteraddress as extremely radical and dangerous.

Amelioration, a Colonial Office attempt to reform slavery in the period before emancipation, gave people of color space to operate regarding religion, education, and philanthropy. Affluent, free people of color opened schools and founded charitable and friendly societies, thus displaying their “respectability.” They constituted themselves as a “public,” and challenged racial discrimination. In 1831 the Barbadian legislature passed the “Brown Privilege Bill,” giving the franchise to free Afro-Barbadian men. It turned out that only about 75 men could vote, because the property qualification was set at 30 pounds of taxable property. The qualification for white males was only 10 pounds! As emancipation approached affluent free people of color and whites cooperated more. For example, merchants in both groups acted together to lobby the legislature to restrict street hucksters, fearing competition from the soon-to-be free. White and Afro-Barbadian men also shared ideas about patriarchal codes of Christian conduct for men and women “centered on the suppression of ‘illegitimate’ sexual relations between whites and people of African descent, the restriction of independent economic activity by women, and the control of free laborers” (p. 8).

During the apprenticeship period, some in the colonial administration saw free people of color as an intermediary group who could help with the transition from slavery to freedom, but the plantocracy resisted any notion of racial equality. It was at this point, in 1833, when the two groups of free people of color – elitist and working class – came together to press for equality for all free subjects. Samuel Jackman Prescod, journalist and politician, emerged as a leader in the free colored community, pushing for political reform and resistance to racial segregation. He was the first man of color to be elected to the Barbados Assembly. He viewed himself as a black Briton and was no democrat.

In the apprenticeship era the free Afro-Barbadian elite, less hopeful of gaining equality with whites, embraced emancipation and claimed former slaves as “brethren,” working to become representatives of the newly free. After “full freedom” in 1838, class tensions surfaced in relation to migration and franchise reform, once more dividing the Afro-Barbadian community. Only a few wealthy Afro-Barbadian men gained appointments and political influence after emancipation because land and wealth stayed largely in white hands. Some decided to migrate to Africa in search of better opportunities.

Melanie Newton has provided a stimulating work that covers more ground and raises more issues than discussed here. The book should be read by all interested in slavery and emancipation in the wider Atlantic world.
Examining commemorations of the French Revolution’s aftermath in Haiti and Martinique, Chris Bongie questions why the relationship between literature and politics in postcolonial scholarship is viewed as an irreconcilable dispute between friends and enemies. He uncovers a conflicted memory – of the political as the expression of a disavowed commonality in a distorted ideal of humanism – in the scribal work of feuding factions. His compilation of previously published works explores the epistemic dialogue between colonial and postcolonial discourses to ponder the future of Francophone postcolonial studies. Bongie promotes a cultural-studies approach embracing the “desacralization of ‘charismatic’ authors and their textual productions” (p. 258) whose commodification he believes has stifled the postcolonial field. His antagonistic stance denounces an elitist bias against scribes or “lesser authors” for a “metonymic fetish”: the “great writer” or “great intellectual.” In so doing, he hopes to offer a new perspective but demonstrates rather how biases in postcolonial theory occult mimetic rivalries between the anticolonial struggle and the participation of writers in institutional discourses of power.

The introduction announces the consecutive sections of the book and sets the tone. Bongie sharply criticizes scholars such as Gayatri Spivak and Robert Young for their take on literature and politics and further questions their supposed biases by an analysis of literary representations of the double political memory of Haïti/Hayti and les frères ennemies, Pétion and Christophe. Part One then probes intriguing shifts between friendship and enmity in French and Haitian “overinvestment” in commemorative events while examin-
ing their antagonistic relationship through the entanglement of politics in the preservation of memory. Setting Régis Debray’s ideas against those of Édouard Glissant, Kwame Appiah, and others, Bongie analyzes conflictive and reductive humanist and humanitarian concepts, considering the latest expression of the “white man’s burden” inherited from the Enlightenment. A close reading of Jean-Baptiste Picquenard’s overlooked novels and versions of Victor Hugo’s Bug-Jargal further critiques the intertwining of humanist and humanitarian ideals. Chapter 1 discusses Picquenard’s political ambivalence in preserving and erasing the memory of revolutionary violence. Chapter 2 explores the rewritings of Bug-Jargal, particularly Leitch Ritchie’s The Slave-King (1833), challenging the original text’s authority and suggesting the importance, in the British abolitionist movement, of scribes such as Ritchie or the Haitian Baron de Vastey.

Part Two exposes the devoir de mémoire, supported by antagonistic figures such as Régis Debray and Édouard Glissant, as the treacherous expression of the interplay between memory and nostalgia. Chapter 3 uses the bicentennial of the Haitian Revolution to denounce Debray’s governmental report in 2004, Haïti et la France, which indicated a nostalgic neo-colonialism born out of what Bongie calls a disturbing ideal of “universal humanism,” and which led to Aristide’s removal from Haiti. Chapter 4 broadens this issue through Martiniquan political debates concerning the sesquicentenary celebration of the abolition of slavery. Squabbles over the “dates” of abolition and the problematic figure of Cyrille Bissette illustrate how the interconnection of memory and nostalgia prevents an accurate reconstruction of the past. Using George Yudice’s examination of the American culture wars, Bongie sees these Martiniquan quarrels as coming from the same hegemonic discourse inherent to the devoir de mémoire. Finally, Chapter 5 is the “less than reverent account of the literary nostalgia … for ‘literature’” (p. 152) in Derek Walcott’s play, The Haitian Trilogy. Bongie chides Walcott for his misrepresentations of Christophe’s mulatto secretary, which erase de Vastey’s anticolonial discourse. Walcott’s “‘sceptical humanist’ representations of History, his cynical disengagement from social movements” (p. 250) betray The Haitian Trilogy as a mere repackaging of three plays: a commodified object of consumption.

Part Three further desacralizes the commodified literary object and “the great writer” as a metonymic fetish. Bongie rails against an elitism that denigrates popular – lowbrow – culture, “perpetuates a watered-down version of canonical thinking and only bothers to give a voice to the ‘people’ when they say, do, and consume the ‘right’ thing” (p. 291). Examining the marginalization of the political in the works of David Scott and Peter Hallward, Bongie claims that severing cultural practices from political agendas in novels by Maryse Condé and Glissant feeds middlebrow popularity. Chapter 6 examines popular authors, such as Tony Delsham, to probe the mechanics at play behind the construction of Condé’s so-called consecrated and fetishistic status in
Francophone and postcolonial spheres by literary critics. Bongie asks scholars to examine both her texts and popular success. In Chapter 7, Bongie discusses Nick Nesbitt’s *Voicing Memory* and its exploration of the popular reception of Edwige Danticat’s work as a guilty pleasure for literary critics and in harshly critiquing Glissant’s recent works. For Bongie, Glissant reiterates ideas that sell and betray their author’s skepticism and cynicism. In addition, Bongie affirms that Glissant’s scribal work for Jacques Chirac’s government evokes the intellectual as a janus-figure both distant and close to power.

Bongie argues with passion for the reconciliation of several *frères ennemis*: literature and politics, the great writer and the scribe, cultural studies and postcolonial studies. His rigorous reworking of previous essays challenges the controversial overview of debates concerning postcolonial scholarship and he calls for a reassessment of the field. Although he relentlessly shares his expertise and his aspiration for the future of Francophone postcolonial scholarship, he does not offer a clear definition of the latter. Indeed, the thoroughness of this deconstructive study may frustrate some readers, since his antagonistic stance may appear questionable. For instance, Bongie’s criticism of the way Walcott and Glissant repackage their previous work as a means to reassert their cultural authority might be undermined by his own repackaging. Nevertheless, his valuable contribution, for those unaware of his scholarship, has opened a Pandora’s box that will generate stimulating conversations among scholars. Perhaps these discussions will allow new voices to be heard.
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In the past few years, critical voices have been calling for a reappraisal of the literary historiography of the Anglophone Caribbean, pleading in particular for more attention to be paid to the writing published before World War II. This artistic production, the argument goes, has been either ignored or under-
stated in much of the recording of the literary history of the region, and should be carefully considered because, as Alison Donnell (2006:13) points out, this would enable us “to re-establish the complexity of both cultural forms and politics pre-1950, thereby opening this archive up to the present and the future.”

Leah Reade Rosenberg’s *Nationalism and the Formation of Caribbean Literature* clearly follows in the wake of such a rationale and constitutes an important contribution to the current revision of the Caribbean literary canon. It aims to tell “the story of the intertwined development of nationalism and literature in the English-speaking Caribbean between 1840 and 1940” (p. 5). It also highlights the exclusionary practices that often underlay the elaboration of this tradition and which can, in many cases, be perceived in the way the writers of the period engaged with matters of gender. Focusing mainly on Trinidad and Jamaica – two islands with “strong literary and political movements in the early twentieth century” (p. 9) – the book is organized in seven chapters, each dedicated to one author, or one group of authors, whose writing contributed to the formation of a literary tradition in the region.

Rosenberg starts with a discussion of three early Trinidadian novels – E.L. Joseph’s *Warner Arundell* (1838), Michel Maxwell Philip’s *Emmanuel Appadocca* (1854), and Stephen Cobham’s *Rupert Gray* (1907) – which, she explains, went some way toward challenging Europe’s claim to superiority. However, she points out, the same cannot always be said of the writers examined in the rest of the book, for in spite of their nationalistic and liberatory claims their works often led to a consolidation of the hierarchies, racial or social, which were advocated by the colonial order. Among the writers studied in the volume are Thomas MacDermot, H.G. de Lisser, Claude McKay, and Una Marson from Jamaica as well as Alfred Mendes and C.L.R. James from Trinidad. The last chapter is devoted to Jean Rhys, which might be surprising as she is from neither Jamaica nor Trinidad, but this focus on an artist who can be regarded as transitional – if only because her work straddles two generations of writers – enables Rosenberg to adopt a comparative approach and wrap up her overall argument.

There are many reasons why *Nationalism and the Formation of Caribbean Literature* should be recommended to scholars working in the field of Caribbean studies. As a well-documented volume using a wide-ranging array of unpublished or hard-to-find material, it provides a solid historical contextualization for the literature it examines, particularly in its thorough study of the role played by cultural networks or by institutions like the press in the establishment of a national body of writing. Rosenberg should also be praised for addressing with determination the many tensions inherent in a literary production which tended to depict working-class characters, many of them female, but nevertheless resorted to a dubious rhetoric of respectability inherited from Victorianism and therefore ended up promoting the interests of the middle class.
Overall, Rosenberg’s focus is very much on the evolution of the literary scene and the development of individual writing careers, which means that relatively little attention is paid to the aesthetic features of the texts themselves (apart from occasional references to their linguistic makeup). As a result, the works’ literary qualities are not really taken into consideration, with the exception of a few reported comments on the disappointing character of some of them (see, for example, p. 35). This is a shame, not only because the passages where the analysis becomes slightly more textual (e.g., the sections devoted to McKay’s *Home to Harlem* and *Banana Bottom*) are among the best in the book, but also because an examination of the artistic value of the works in question would, in some cases, have explained why they have not received much recognition. Another regret is that some of the critical foci announced in the introduction are not fully developed in the body of the book; the notion of creolization is sporadically touched upon, notably in relation to Trinidadian yard fiction, but should have been tackled more directly, or perhaps more clearly. Finally, the book suffers from a certain vagueness, especially in its referencing system and in the terminology it deploys. For example, a word such as “elite,” which is central to the argument, tends to be used rather loosely.

Ground-breaking because of its subject matter, *Nationalism and the Formation of Caribbean Literature* is also remarkable because it opens onto other original, if underexploited, vistas. It testifies, for example, to the importance of alternative sexualities in the construction of Caribbean identity. This field has not yet been fully charted and would have deserved even more explicit coverage in this book. More could also have been said on the relationship between pre-1950s Caribbean writers and the Windrush generation. Rosenberg offers a few points of comparison with George Lamming in the course of her book, and expands on this a little in her short afterword. Yet her explanations remain sketchy on the whole, which might suggest that there is material for another book in this.

**Reference**

This new study of Maryse Condé’s fiction finds its place in an already rich body of critical work. To date, however, most of it has appeared in edited books by multiple authors. This may be about to change since in the past four years, several single-authored books have been published on Condé’s novels. Dawn Fulton analyzes Condé’s work in the context of complex discussions of postcolonialism because, she argues, Condé stages in her novels “a sustained dialogue with the critical discussions surrounding her work” (p. 2). Fulton also points to the choice of the novelist’s intertexts because they “specifically engage the critical discourse surrounding Condé’s fiction” while “challeng[ing] the various lenses through which they are read” (p. 3). *Signs of Dissent* thus stands out as a study strongly anchored in important theoretical dialogues. It also gives full place to the significance of the discussion between fiction and critical theory in which Fulton is a full participant.

In order to give her study the focus it deserves, Fulton concentrates on three key concepts – “temporal continuity, internal coherence, and representativity” (p. 9) – and sees how they appear and build on one another in Condé’s fiction. This is quite helpful because it offers some focus in the otherwise immense field of postcolonial studies. Fulton also stresses the importance of parody in Condé’s work, and points to Condé’s playful spirit as she urges the reader, in an interview, not to “take Tituba too seriously” (p. 48). Indeed, Condé is willing to flip on its head every certitude the reader comes up with like so many clean boxes where characters and ideas are thought to be placed safely. As Fulton argues, Condé is unwilling to have her work boxed in, just as she is unwilling to be boxed in herself. Thanks to this reading, Fulton offers some insights on the “perversions of parody” (p. 48) and multiple “transgressions” (p. 103) in Condé’s work.

The study is divided into seven chapters, each focusing on one or two novels. While the theme for each chapter is carefully presented and fits nicely with the chosen novel, it remains unclear why these specific novels were selected over others. The corpus of Maryse Condé’s work is extremely varied and some novels have been widely studied while others could benefit from
additional readings. Chapter 1 finds contemporary echoes of transnational discussions in some of Condé’s early work (two novels and some critical work) as it highlights how the global can sometimes clash with the local, resulting in misunderstandings. Chapter 2 focuses on the well-known novel *I, Tituba, Black Witch of Salem* and offers an interesting vision of Tituba as an anthropologist (p. 42). Chapter 3 deals with novels in which disorder and destruction of boundaries are central and result in the impossibility to certify one’s genealogy. Chapter 4 gives an interesting reading of the theme of trauma in *Desirada*, linking the individual trauma of the main character, Marie-Noëlle, who is unable to find information about her father, to the collective trauma of the Caribbean people dispossessed of their land and identity.

Chapters 5-7 are without doubt the most interesting because they are dealing with some of the most recent novels: *Célanire cou-coupé* (2000), *La Belle Créole* (2001) and *Histoire de la femme cannibale* (2003). Very few critical articles, if any, have been published on these books and the only discussions of them have taken place at scholarly conferences. Written and published reflections are thus welcome as a serious addition to the field. Chapter 5 offers an insightful reading of *Célanire cou-coupé* in light of Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* and exposes Condé’s work in a new light for those who had read it only in the context of postcolonial studies. Chapter 6 discusses *La Belle Créole* in a politically charged context: one where the debate on slavery reparations is central. While the analysis is convincing, it would have benefited from some information about Condé’s presence in one specific governmental project: the *Comité pour la Mémoire de l’esclavage* (Committee for the Memory of Slavery) created in April 2004 and of which she was the president. Even though the report cannot be considered one of Condé’s texts since it was discussed and written in a collective spirit, her participation in it informs, and is informed by, opinions and ideas she develops in her fiction. Finally, Chapter 7 is an engaging reading of *Histoire de la femme cannibale*. Fulton’s comments on cannibalism through the centuries from a perspective more anthropological than literary are valuable and she draws the link between the two nicely.

The conclusion of *Signs of Dissent* explains something that might otherwise have appeared as a shortcoming: that is, the problematic of translation for an author who writes in French but is widely read – and studied – in English translation. As such, one can understand Fulton’s choice to study Condé’s work for its ideological content more than its literary one since, as she notes: “the fact that many of the assessments of Condé’s work that I have discussed in this study are readings of the English translations of her novels adds an important dimension to the critical dialogue she undertakes in her fiction” (p. 143).

Overall, *Signs of Dissent* is a nice contribution to the field of Caribbean studies. Other than the introduction which feels, at times, linguistically overburdened, Fulton’s readings of Condé’s work are made from an interesting angle.
Discerning the sequence of prehistoric cultural traditions in the Caribbean has for decades been the primary focus of archaeological research in the region. Irving Rouse’s well-known text, *The Taino: The Rise and Decline of the People Who Greeted Columbus* (1992) has often served as the foundation for these discussions and is widely used in Caribbean prehistory courses. Samuel M. Wilson’s *The Archaeology of the Caribbean* offers a fresh alternative to Rouse’s work and provides a dynamic model that overcomes many of the shortcomings of the more descriptive culture history approach. While recognizing the value of Rouse’s earlier work, Wilson emphasizes cultural diversity in the Caribbean in prehistoric times and highlights the interactions between different groups in the region. Moreover, Wilson creatively draws on key sites investigated by archaeologists to challenge the static and homogeneous view of Caribbean peoples in prehistoric times.

Wilson places the Caribbean in the broader framework of world prehistory studies and outlines the unique character of human settlement and social organization in the region. The Caribbean was a final frontier for humans. Beginning only 4,000 years ago, the migration of peoples into the Caribbean was one of the last stages in their settlement of the globe. Wilson provides an up-to-date discussion of the debates concerning the settlement of the islands and clearly traces the mainland origins of Caribbean peoples. He skillfully articulates the impact of cultural interactions between hunting and gathering migrants from the Yucatan and those from the Orinoco Delta region of South America, painting a picture of the Caribbean that is fluid and dynamic. Once settled, the new migrants were no longer constrained by the cultural conservatism of their mainland ancestors. They shed traditional ways, adapted to their new environment, and developed new cultures that blended the traditions of different mainland groups. As a frontier made up of migrants from different mainland regions, the Caribbean provided a testing ground for innovation. Wilson argues, for example, that zones of interaction, such as those between Antigua and Puerto Rico, were important meeting points for hunting/gathering peoples from the Yucatan and others from South America,
which spurred changes in social, political, and economic organization. The movement of Saladoid horticulturalists into the Caribbean beginning around 2,000 years ago further stimulated cultural change and ethnogenesis. Wilson argues that these Saladoid migrants were not simply a homogeneous group that replaced earlier peoples, but a flexible force that added to the dynamism and diversity of the region. He also examines the role that inter-island and mainland exchange networks played in shaping prehistoric Caribbean societies. Finally, even though his primary focus is on the cultural developments in the Greater Antilles, he provides an important overview of the major archaeological sites and issues concerning the cultural trajectories of Amerindian peoples in the Lesser Antilles before and after the arrival of Europeans.

Perhaps Wilson’s greatest contribution is his analysis of emerging chiefdoms in the Greater Antilles beginning around AD 600. Again, he highlights the blending of cultural traditions and the emergence of new cultural forms, looking at evidence from Maisabel, Tribes, and Caguana in Puerto Rico to show the transition from small-scale communal Saladoid villages to larger and more politically complex ranked Taino societies. He draws on an extensive amount of archaeological evidence from a geographically diverse range of archaeological sites in the region to reveal this shift. The transition to ranked societies is most evident in changing settlement patterns and burial practices. Early Saladoid peoples buried their dead communally in central ceremonial spaces ringed by communal houses. As these Saladoid villages grew in population and political complexity, communal burial areas gave way to individual burials tied to individual households. The shift reflected a transition from the egalitarian Saladoid village life to the lineage-based system of leadership that would characterize Taino political organization. In Taino polities, central areas within villages remained communal spaces, though they were used as ball courts and ceremonial plazas for the display of kingship and other community events. Using archaeological and ethno-historical evidence, Wilson provides an excellent overview of Taino cultural practices. He highlights diversity within Taino societies (especially differences between Taino chiefdoms in Puerto Rico and Hispaniola), reveals the extent of Taino cultural and political influence, and explicates the nature of culture change at interaction zones at the fringes of the Taino world.

Wilson offers a well-organized, well-written, and timely study of Caribbean archaeology that underscores the dynamic and diverse nature of Caribbean societies before and after the arrival of Europeans. He untangles the complexities of Caribbean prehistory and breaks us free from the bonds of the descriptive and complicated culture history scholarship. More importantly, for those of us teaching courses in Caribbean prehistory, this book provides a clear and readable text that will facilitate teaching and inspire students to pursue further interest in the Caribbean region. It is a must-read for all serious scholars of Caribbean archaeology and will serve as an excellent text for introductory courses in that field.
Over the last two decades, the application of the natural and physical sciences in archaeology, commonly referred to as archaeometry or archaeological science, has gradually been adopted as a part of the Caribbean archaeologist’s tool kit for wrestling technological, cultural, and historical information from archaeological sites and collections. In 2006, the leading archaeometric specialists working with Caribbean sites and artifacts gathered at the Society for American Archaeology conference in Puerto Rico for a symposium showcasing recent approaches. The symposium ultimately evolved into the anthology under review here.

Crossing the Borders begins with an introduction by the co-editors to the study of archaeological materials, including a useful historical overview of Caribbean archaeology. This is followed by fourteen case studies prepared by experts from both sides of the Atlantic, and an epilogue by Taíno specialist William Keegan. Obviously intended for other archaeologists, the case studies do an excellent job of demonstrating the fundamental role that archaeometry now plays in Caribbean archaeology and illustrate the diversity of experience and backgrounds of the researchers. Keegan’s epilogue, meanwhile, respectfully tenders an acknowledgement to the pioneering archaeometric studies that laid the groundwork over the last thirty years for the current generation of scholars. Keegan also does well to remind readers that showcasing methodological or technological sophistication is never
enough, and that asking good questions is still the most important part of any archaeological investigation.

The first three case studies (Chapters 2-4) feature techniques for determining the origins of ceramics, metals, and lithic artifacts. The three editors combine conventional archaeological analysis, geochemical analysis, and ethnoarchaeological research to determine the provenance of pottery fragments recovered on Saba. Their evidence indicates that most of the pottery was manufactured from local clays; however, as much as one third was manufactured from non-local sources. Drawing on their ethnoarchaeological evidence, they argue that the clay must have been part of the exchange network of Amerindians. Jago Cooper, Marcos Martinón-Torres, and Roberto Valcárcel Rojas then trace the origin, composition, and manufacture of metal objects from a Taíno cemetery in Cuba; theirs is the only case study in the volume that focuses on the poorly understood contact period. They determine that the metal objects are of European origin and suggest new insights into indigenous trade systems, as well as the influence of European colonizers on Taíno customs and values. In the final provenance study, Sebastiaan Knippenburg and Johannes Zijlstra review the methodology for characterizing the chemical composition of flint and chert artifacts as a productive technique for determining where Amerindians sourced raw materials for stone tools.

The next three chapters examine Amerindian manufacturing processes. In Chapter 5, Charlene Dixon Hutcheson profiles the use of dental molds of basket-impressed ceramics from the Bahamas for studying weaving techniques in the absence of the original artifacts. Christy de Mille, Tamara Varney, and Michael Turney investigate the drilling technology of the Saladoid lapidary industries on Antigua using casts of bead bore holes and scanning electron microscopy. And Benoît Béard presents a research plan for examining stone tool manufacture by comparing Huecan and Cedrosan Saladoid assemblages, aimed at clarifying distinctions between the two cultural traditions.

The microscopic analysis of tools, and the residues adhering to cutting surfaces is the focus of Chapters 8-12. Van Gijn, Yvonne Lammers-Keijzers, and Iris Briels employ use-wear analysis of ceramics, stones, shells, and coral to reconstruct activities. Building on these results, Harold J. Kelly and Van Gijn compare use-wear on coral artifacts to replicate tools. Combining use-wear analysis, plant phytolith, and starch residue analysis, Channah Nieuwenhuis assesses the function of specific stone tools and pottery in plant processing in Saba. Also focusing on plant remains, Jaime Pagán Jiménez and José Oliver compare starch residues on stone tools between various Puerto Rican sites to suggest different systems of agricultural production on the island. Starch residues are also examined on ceramic griddles from Cuba by Roberto Rodriguez and Pagán Jiménez in their evaluation of the notion that griddles were used solely for the production of cassava bread.
The last three chapters feature paleobotanical and paleo-osteological research. Lee Newsom reviews the newest methods and techniques in the study of plant remains. Alfredo Coppa and a number of collaborators present dental evidence for two separate migratory waves in the circum-Caribbean. Finally, Mathijs Booden et al. use strontium isotopes from teeth and bone to trace the origin of the population at the Toulmassoid site of Anse à la Gourde in Guadeloupe.

To echo Keegan (p. 231), Crossing the Borders ushers Caribbean archaeology into a new phase. Excavation is no longer an end in itself, and finds lists no longer constitute the totality of an archaeologist’s analytical capability. With the aim of becoming both methodologically and theoretically more sophisticated, the archaeometric methods profiled in this volume represent new and innovative ways to address a wider range of questions than was previously possible. Well-written and illustrated, the book is a showcase of some of the most interesting and thoughtful archaeological research underway in the Caribbean.